

Louis H. Feldman  
Josephus and Modern Scholarship  
(1937–1980)



Louis H. Feldman

Josephus  
and Modern Scholarship  
(1937–1980)



Walter de Gruyter · Berlin · New York

1984

This volume has been issued under the general editorship of  
Wolfgang Haase, Tübingen

*CIP-Kurztitelaufnahme der Deutschen Bibliothek*

**Feldman, Louis H.:**

Josephus and modern scholarship : (1937–1980) / Louis H. Feldman. — Berlin ; New York : de Gruyter, 1984.

ISBN 3-11-008138-5

©

1984 by Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin 30

Alle Rechte, insbesondere das der Übersetzung in fremde Sprachen, vorbehalten. Ohne ausdrückliche Genehmigung des Verlages ist es auch nicht gestattet, dieses Buch oder Teile daraus auf photomechanischem Wege (Photokopie, Mikrokopie) zu vervielfältigen.

Printed in Germany

Satz und Druck: Arthur Collignon GmbH, Berlin

Buchbinder: Lüderitz & Bauer, Berlin

## Table of Contents

1: Introduction: General . . . . .	1
1.0: Introduction . . . . .	1
1.1: The Quantity and Languages of Josephan Scholarship . . . . .	2
2: Bibliography . . . . .	4
2.0: Bibliography of Jewish Bibliographies . . . . .	4
2.1: General Bibliography of Hebrew Books . . . . .	4
2.2: Published Catalogues of Jewish Collections . . . . .	4
2.3: Dissertations on Jewish Subjects . . . . .	6
2.4: Indices of Jewish <i>Festschriften</i> . . . . .	7
2.5: Annual Classical Bibliographies . . . . .	7
2.6: Annual Biblical Bibliographies . . . . .	8
2.7: Annual Jewish Bibliographies . . . . .	8
2.8: Collected Bibliographies of Jewish Studies Aiming at Completeness . . . . .	9
2.9: Selective Bibliographies Pertaining to Josephus through the Nineteenth Century . . . . .	9
2.10: Selective Bibliographies Pertaining to Josephus for the Twentieth Century . . . . .	9
2.11: Regularly Appearing Annotated Bibliographies of Hellenistic Judaism . . . . .	11
2.12: Brief Selective Bibliographies of Hellenistic Judaism . . . . .	12
2.13: Specialized Bibliographies in Areas Covered by or Related to Josephus: the Septuagint . . . . .	12
2.14: Specialized Bibliographies: the New Testament . . . . .	13
2.15: Specialized Bibliographies: Philo . . . . .	14
2.16: Specialized Bibliographies: the Essenes, the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Slavonic Josephus (see also 22.10) . . . . .	14
2.17: Specialized Bibliographies: Bibliographies of Individual Scholars . . . . .	16
2.18: Bibliographies Devoted Specifically to Josephus . . . . .	16
3: The Text . . . . .	20
3.0: Editions of the Greek Text . . . . .	20
3.1: Transmission of the Text . . . . .	21
3.2: Studies of Individual Manuscripts and of Early Printed Editions . . . . .	24
3.3: Textual Criticism . . . . .	25
4: Translations into Modern Languages . . . . .	28
4.0: Translations (with or without Commentaries) into English . . . . .	28
4.1: Translations (with or without Commentaries) into French . . . . .	32
4.2: Translations (with or without Commentaries) into German . . . . .	33
4.3: Translations (with or without Commentaries) into Hebrew . . . . .	34
4.4: Translations (with or without Commentaries) into Italian . . . . .	36
4.5: Translations (with or without Commentaries) into Spanish . . . . .	36
4.6: Translations (with or without Commentaries) into Other Languages: Arabic, Czech, Dutch, Modern Greek, Hungarian, Japanese, Polish, Portuguese, Russian, Serbian . . . . .	37

5: The Latin and Syriac Versions . . . . .	40
5.0: The Latin Versions: Introduction . . . . .	40
5.1: The Name Hegesippus . . . . .	40
5.2: The Text of Hegesippus . . . . .	40
5.3: Authorship of Hegesippus . . . . .	41
5.4: The Content of Hegesippus and Its Relation to Josippon . . . . .	42
5.5: The Text of the Latin Version Made under Cassiodorus' Direction . . . . .	43
5.6: Individual Manuscripts and Early Printed Editions of the Latin Version . . . . .	44
5.7: Authorship of the Latin Josephus . . . . .	45
5.8: Importance of the Latin Version . . . . .	46
5.9: The Syriac Version . . . . .	47
6: The Slavonic Version . . . . .	48
6.0: The Text of the Slavonic Version and Translations Thereof . . . . .	48
6.1: The Language of the Slavonic Version . . . . .	49
6.2: The Date, Source, Authorship, and Purpose of the Slavonic Josephus . . . . .	49
6.3: Problems of Genuineness, Omissions, and Additions of the Slavonic Version . . . . .	51
6.4: The Slavonic Version, the Dead Sea Scrolls, and the Essenes . . . . .	55
6.5: Translations Dependent upon the Slavonic Version . . . . .	56
7: Josippon . . . . .	57
7.0: Josippon (Josefon, Yosephon, Josephon) (the Hebrew Version of the 'Jewish War'): General . . . . .	57
7.1: The Text of Josippon . . . . .	58
7.2: Translations of Josippon . . . . .	61
7.3: Authorship and Authenticity of Josippon . . . . .	62
7.4: The Date and Place of Composition of Josippon . . . . .	62
7.5: The Sources of Josippon . . . . .	66
7.6: The Content and Outlook of Josippon . . . . .	71
7.7: The Arabic and Ethiopic Versions of Josippon . . . . .	73
8: Josephus' Life . . . . .	75
8.0: Josephus' Life: General . . . . .	75
8.1: Sources for Josephus' Life . . . . .	76
8.2: Josephus' Family, Education, and Early Life . . . . .	79
8.3: Josephus' Appointment as Military General in Galilee . . . . .	84
8.4: Josephus' Conduct as Military General in Galilee . . . . .	87
8.5: Josephus' Surrender at Jotapata . . . . .	88
8.6: Josephus' Prophecy to Vespasian . . . . .	93
8.7: Josephus and Justus of Tiberias . . . . .	96
9: General Accounts of Josephus . . . . .	99
9.0: Older Books and Articles on Josephus in General . . . . .	99
9.1: Book-length Studies (1937–1980) Dealing with Josephus in General . . . . .	104
9.2: Shorter General Accounts of Josephus' Life and Works in Encyclopedias . . . . .	107
9.3: Shorter General Accounts of Josephus' Life and Works in Books Other than Ency- clopedias . . . . .	112
9.4: Josephus' Conception of Historiography in General . . . . .	117
10: Josephus' Paraphrase of the Bible . . . . .	121
10.0: Josephus' Treatment of the Biblical Period: the Problem of Josephus' Modifications of the Bible Generally . . . . .	121
10.1: The Nature of Josephus' Modifications of the Bible in General . . . . .	125

10.2: Josephus' Biblical Text in General . . . . .	130
10.3: Josephus' Use of the Septuagint and of Targumim for the Hexateuch . . . . .	131
10.4: The Canon of the Bible . . . . .	134
10.5: Josephus' Version of Genesis for the pre-Abrahamic Period . . . . .	139
10.6: Josephus' Portrayal of Abraham, Melchisedek, and Isaac . . . . .	143
10.7: Joseph . . . . .	148
10.8: Moses and the Exodus . . . . .	149
10.9: Manetho, the Hyksos, and the Exodus . . . . .	157
10.10: The Sojourn of the Israelites in the Wilderness . . . . .	161
10.11: Joshua and Judges . . . . .	163
10.12: Ruth . . . . .	164
10.13: Josephus' Biblical Text for Samuel through I Maccabees . . . . .	165
10.14: Josephus on Specific Passages in Samuel and Kings . . . . .	170
10.15: Daniel . . . . .	178
10.16: The Prophetic Books . . . . .	181
10.17: Ezra and Nehemiah: General (see 11.1) . . . . .	183
10.18: Particular Passages in Ezra and Nehemiah (see 11.1) . . . . .	186
10.19: Esther . . . . .	189
11: Josephus as Historian of the Post-Biblical Period (until 63 B.C.E.): General Issues . . . . .	192
11.0: Josephus' Treatment of the Post-Biblical Period: General . . . . .	192
11.1: Josephus' Treatment of the Persian Period . . . . .	199
11.2: Josephus' Treatment of the Hellenistic Period: General . . . . .	200
12: Josephus as Historian of the Post-Biblical Period: Specific Events . . . . .	207
12.0: Josephus on Alexander the Great . . . . .	207
12.1: Josephus' Version of the 'Letter of Aristeas' . . . . .	208
12.2: Early Seleucid History . . . . .	210
12.3: Antiochus III . . . . .	212
12.4: The Tobiads . . . . .	215
12.5: The Relationship between the Jews and the Spartans . . . . .	217
12.6: Josephus' Version of I Maccabees . . . . .	219
12.7: Josephus' Relationship to II Maccabees . . . . .	225
12.8: Antiochus IV (Epiphanes) and the Background of the Maccabean Revolt . . . . .	226
12.9: Mattathias and Judah Maccabee . . . . .	233
12.10: Antiochus V, VI, and VII . . . . .	234
12.11: The Rulers of Egypt during the Third, Second, and First Centuries B.C.E. . . . .	236
12.12: Anti-Semitism in Ptolemaic Egypt . . . . .	237
12.13: The Hasmonean Kings Generally . . . . .	241
12.14: The Alliance of the Hasmoneans with the Romans . . . . .	245
12.15: The Kittim of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Seleucids or Romans? . . . . .	245
12.16: Jonathan the Hasmonean . . . . .	247
12.17: Simon the Hasmonean . . . . .	248
12.18: John Hyrcanus . . . . .	249
12.19: Alexander Jannaeus . . . . .	251
13: Josephus as Historian of the Roman Period (from Pompey until Herod) . . . . .	259
13.0: The Roman Period: General . . . . .	259
13.1: Anti-Semitism during the Roman Period . . . . .	266
13.2: Josephus on Roman Institutions . . . . .	267
13.3: Roman Taxation on Jews . . . . .	267
13.4: Jews in the Roman Army . . . . .	267
13.5: Hyrcanus II and Pompey . . . . .	268

13.6: The Partition of Judaea by Gabinius . . . . .	272
13.7: The Documents in 'Antiquities', Book 14 . . . . .	273
13.8: Antigonus . . . . .	276
13.9: Antipater . . . . .	277
14: Herod . . . . .	278
14.0: Herod: General Treatments . . . . .	278
14.1: Herod: the Numismatic Evidence . . . . .	287
14.2: Herod's Appearance . . . . .	288
14.3: Herod's Title 'the Great' . . . . .	288
14.4: The Chronology of Herod's Reign . . . . .	289
14.5: Herod's Trial before the Sanhedrin . . . . .	289
14.6: Herod's Legal Position vis-à-vis Augustus and the Roman Empire . . . . .	290
14.7: Herod and Babylonian Jewry . . . . .	291
14.8: Herod as Administrator . . . . .	292
14.9: Herod's Military Colony of Batanaea . . . . .	292
14.10: The Place of Sports in Herod's Politics (see also 20.9) . . . . .	292
14.11: Herod's Building Program . . . . .	293
14.12: Herod, the Temple, and the High Priesthood . . . . .	295
14.13: Herod's Trial against His Sons . . . . .	296
14.14: Herod and Mariamne . . . . .	296
14.15: Herod and Cleopatra . . . . .	297
14.16: Herod as Messiah . . . . .	297
14.17: Herod's Death . . . . .	298
14.18: The Aftermath of Herod's Death . . . . .	299
14.19: The Herodian Family in General . . . . .	300
14.20: Phasael and Archelaus . . . . .	301
14.21: Herod Antipas and Herodias . . . . .	301
15: The Period after Herod until the Outbreak of the War against the Romans . . . . .	304
15.0: Josephus on Parthian Affairs (Antiquities 18. 39–52, etc.) . . . . .	304
15.1: The Autonomous Jewish State of Anilaus and Asinaeus under the Parthians . . . . .	306
15.2: Josephus on Arab Affairs (cf. 25.21) . . . . .	307
15.3: The Ituraeans . . . . .	308
15.4: Josephus on Petty States in Asia Minor and Vicinity . . . . .	308
15.5: The Emperor Augustus and the Jews . . . . .	309
15.6: The Emperor Tiberius and the Jews . . . . .	309
15.7: The Roman Procurators before Pontius Pilate . . . . .	311
15.8: Pontius Pilate: General . . . . .	312
15.9: The Episode of Pilate's Introduction of the Emperor's Standards into Jerusalem . . . . .	316
15.10: Pilate: the New Inscription . . . . .	317
15.11: The Procurators after Pilate . . . . .	320
15.12: Agrippa I . . . . .	323
15.13: Gaius Caligula and Claudius . . . . .	326
15.14: The Citizenship of the Alexandrian Jews and Claudius' Edict . . . . .	331
15.15: Josephus on Philo and His Family . . . . .	338
15.16: The Status of the Jews in Syria, Especially Antioch . . . . .	338
15.17: The Jews of Asia Minor . . . . .	339
15.18: The Status of the Jews in Cyrene . . . . .	340
15.19: The Jews of Rome . . . . .	341
15.20: Agrippa II and Berenice . . . . .	341
15.21: Izates and Adiabene (see also 24.1) . . . . .	343
15.22: Nero . . . . .	345

16: The War against the Romans . . . . .	346
16.0: Josephus as a Source for the Great Jewish Revolt against the Romans (66–74 C.E.)	346
16.1: Chronology of Events of the War . . . . .	350
16.2: The Coins as a Source for the Jewish War in General (see also 25.25) . . . . .	350
16.3: Numismatic Evidence for the Jewish War in Galilee (see also 25.25) . . . . .	351
16.4: The Causes and Goals of the War . . . . .	351
16.5: Babylonian Jewry and the War . . . . .	356
16.6: The Progress of the War . . . . .	356
16.7: The Siege of Jerusalem . . . . .	361
16.8: The Burning of the Temple . . . . .	363
16.9: The Population of Palestine and of Jerusalem in Particular in the First Century	366
16.10: Military Aspects of the War and in Josephus in General . . . . .	370
16.11: Vespasian and Titus . . . . .	371
16.12: The Arch of Titus . . . . .	375
16.13: Domitian . . . . .	377
17: Special Problems in Connection with Josephus' Works . . . . .	378
17.0: Special Problems in Connection with Josephus' Works: the 'War' . . . . .	378
17.1: Special Problems in Connection with Josephus' Works: the 'Life' . . . . .	380
17.2: Special Problems in Connection with Josephus' Works: 'Against Apion' . . . . .	384
17.3: Proposed Works . . . . .	387
17.4: Doubtful and Spurious Works . . . . .	389
17.5: Falsifications in Josephus . . . . .	391
18: Josephus' Sources . . . . .	392
18.0: Josephus' Sources: General . . . . .	392
18.1: Herodotus and Thucydides . . . . .	394
18.2: Other Classical Greek Writers of the Fifth Century B.C.E. . . . .	394
18.3: Menander . . . . .	394
18.4: Clearchus of Soli and Hermippus of Smyrna . . . . .	395
18.5: Hecataeus and Pseudo-Hecataeus . . . . .	396
18.6: Berossus . . . . .	400
18.7: Demetrius of Phalerum . . . . .	400
18.8: Aristobulus . . . . .	400
18.9: Alexander Polyhistor . . . . .	401
18.10: Eupolemus . . . . .	401
18.11: Artapanus . . . . .	402
18.12: Nicolaus of Damascus . . . . .	402
18.13: Strabo . . . . .	406
18.14: Dionysius of Halicarnassus . . . . .	407
18.15: 'Longinus' . . . . .	408
18.16: The Testament (Assumption) of Moses . . . . .	409
18.17: Philo (see also 2.15) . . . . .	410
18.18: Pseudo-Philo's 'Biblical Antiquities' . . . . .	418
18.19: Sallust . . . . .	419
19: Josephus' Views on the Jewish Religion . . . . .	420
19.0: Josephus' Outlook on Judaism: General . . . . .	420
19.1: G-d . . . . .	423
19.2: The Decalogue . . . . .	428
19.3: Demons . . . . .	429
19.4: Magic . . . . .	429
19.5: Dreams . . . . .	430

19.6: The Soul . . . . .	430
19.7: Fate and Free Will . . . . .	431
19.8: Suffering . . . . .	434
19.9: Prayer . . . . .	435
19.10: The Synagogue . . . . .	436
19.11: Baptism . . . . .	437
19.12: The Priests Generally . . . . .	437
19.13: The Description of the Temple . . . . .	438
19.14: The Warning Inscription of the Temple . . . . .	444
19.15: The Half-Shekel Tax of the Temple and Other Donations . . . . .	447
19.16: Excavations of the Temple Area (see also 25.12) . . . . .	447
19.17: The High Priesthood . . . . .	448
19.18: The Clothing and Stones of the High Priest . . . . .	457
19.19: The Effects of the Destruction of the Temple . . . . .	458
19.20: The Temple at Leontopolis . . . . .	459
19.21: The Sanhedrin . . . . .	463
19.22: Rabbinic Sages: Onias (Hōni) and Pollio (Abtalion) . . . . .	467
19.23: Prophecy . . . . .	469
19.24: False Prophets . . . . .	476
19.25: Miracles . . . . .	477
19.26: Josephus' Philosophy of History . . . . .	480
19.27: Josephus' Political Theory . . . . .	481
19.28: The Chosen People . . . . .	482
19.29: Josephus' Philosophy of Education . . . . .	482
19.30: Josephus' Attitude toward the Land of Israel . . . . .	482
19.31: Resurrection . . . . .	483
19.32: The Messiah and Eschatology in General . . . . .	484
19.33: The Messianic Background of the Jewish Revolt . . . . .	489
19.34: Josephus' Attitude toward Women . . . . .	491
20: Josephus' Views on Halakhah (Jewish Law) . . . . .	492
20.0: Josephus' Attitude toward Halakhah (Jewish Law): General . . . . .	492
20.1: Courts, Witnesses, and Punishments . . . . .	498
20.2: Religious Law: the Priesthood and Other Laws of Ritual . . . . .	500
20.3: The Calendar . . . . .	502
20.4: The Sabbath . . . . .	503
20.5: Sabbatical Years and Jubilees . . . . .	506
20.6: Festivals . . . . .	507
20.7: Sacrifices and Ritual Banquets . . . . .	511
20.8: Idolatry . . . . .	512
20.9: Athletics (see also 14.10) . . . . .	515
20.10: Attitude toward Foreign Cults . . . . .	516
20.11: Attitude toward Other Philosophies . . . . .	519
20.12: Law of Persons: Slavery, Charity, Marriage, Abortion, Divorce . . . . .	519
20.13: Theft, Kidnapping, Agency . . . . .	522
20.14: Suicide . . . . .	524
20.15: Treatment of Animals . . . . .	526
21: Religious Movements: the Samaritans . . . . .	528
21.0: Religious Movements: the Samaritans: Josephus as a Source . . . . .	528
21.1: The Origin of the Samaritans . . . . .	533
21.2: The Building of the Samaritan Temple . . . . .	537
21.3: Events in the History of the Samaritans . . . . .	539

22: The Pharisees and Divergent Jewish Sects . . . . .	542
22.0: The Jewish Sects: General . . . . .	542
22.1: The Views of the Sects: Fate and Prophecy . . . . .	549
22.2: The Pharisees: General . . . . .	551
22.3: The Pharisees in the 'War' and in the 'Antiquities' . . . . .	560
22.4: The Name, Definition, and Origin of the Pharisees . . . . .	562
22.5: The Beliefs and Practices of the Pharisees . . . . .	566
22.6: The History of the Pharisees: Opposition to Hellenism, to the Hasmonean Kings, and to the Great War against Rome . . . . .	569
22.7: The Relationship of the Pharisees to Apocalyptic Groups and to the Dead Sea Sect . . . . .	572
22.8: The Influence of the Pharisees (see also 22.3) . . . . .	574
22.9: The Sadducees . . . . .	579
22.10: The Essenes in Josephus: Bibliography (see also 2.16) . . . . .	580
22.11: The Texts Pertaining to the Essenes in Josephus . . . . .	580
22.12: Josephus' Account of the Essenes: General . . . . .	582
22.13: The Authenticity of Josephus' Account of the Essenes . . . . .	586
22.14: Comparison of the Accounts of the Essenes in the 'War' and in the 'Antiquities' . . . . .	587
22.15: The Etymology of the Name Essenes . . . . .	588
22.16: The Origin of the Essenes . . . . .	590
22.17: Josephus' Relationship to Other Sources for the Essenes: Philo, the 'Sibylline Oracles', Hippolytus (see also 27.11) . . . . .	592
22.18: Beliefs and Practices of the Essenes: General . . . . .	594
22.19: The Attitude of the Essenes toward the Temple and Sacrifices . . . . .	597
22.20: Ritual and Practices of the Essenes: Initiation, Baths, Purity, Asceticism, Prayer, Work . . . . .	600
22.21: The Meals of the Essenes . . . . .	605
22.22: The Oaths of the Essenes . . . . .	607
22.23: The Pacifism of the Essenes . . . . .	609
22.24: The History of the Essenes . . . . .	610
22.25: The Relationship of the Essenes to Other Movements: the Herodians . . . . .	612
22.26: The Essenes and Hermeticism, Gnosticism, the Therapeutae, and the Essenes of Ephesus . . . . .	614
22.27: The Essenes and the Dacians . . . . .	616
22.28: The Essenes and the Magi . . . . .	617
22.29: The Relationship of the Essenes to the Dead Sea Sect . . . . .	618
22.30: The Relationship of the Essenes to the Christians . . . . .	633
22.31: The Zealots: General . . . . .	637
22.32: The Name and Origin of the Zealots . . . . .	642
22.33: The Relationship of the Maccabees to the Zealots . . . . .	646
22.34: The Views of the Zealots . . . . .	647
22.35: The Relationship of the Zealots to the Essenes and to the Dead Sea Sect . . . . .	648
22.36: The Relationship of the Zealots to Jesus and to Early Christianity . . . . .	651
22.37: The Sicarii, the Fourth Philosophy, and the Zealots . . . . .	655
22.38: The Galilaeans . . . . .	667
22.39: The ἁριστᾶί . . . . .	670
22.40: Individual Revolutionary Leaders: Judas of Galilee, John of Gischala, Simon bar Giora, Menahem . . . . .	670
23: Christianity . . . . .	673
23.0: Josephus on John the Baptist . . . . .	673
23.1: The 'Testimonium Flavianum' on Jesus: Bibliography . . . . .	679
23.2: The 'Testimonium Flavianum': General . . . . .	680
23.3: Josephus' Sources for the 'Testimonium Flavianum' . . . . .	691

23.4: Josephus' Motives for Inserting the "Testimonium" . . . . .	691
23.5: The "Testimonium Flavianum": "He Was the Messiah" . . . . .	693
23.6: The "Testimonium Flavianum", Origen, and Eusebius . . . . .	695
23.7: The "Testimonium Flavianum": the Context . . . . .	696
23.8: The "Testimonium Flavianum": Its Language . . . . .	697
23.9: Jesus' Appearance according to the Original "Testimonium" . . . . .	699
23.10: The Arabic and Syriac Versions of the "Testimonium Flavianum" . . . . .	700
23.11: Jesus Son of Ananias . . . . .	703
23.12: Josephus on James . . . . .	704
23.13: Josephus' Relationship to the New Testament: General . . . . .	707
23.14: The Census of Quirinius in Josephus and in Luke . . . . .	709
23.15: Theudas in Josephus and in Acts . . . . .	717
23.16: Other Parallels between Josephus and Luke-Acts . . . . .	719
23.17: Parallels between Josephus and Other Books of the New Testament . . . . .	723
24: Proselytes and 'Sympathizers' . . . . .	726
24.0: Proselytes in Josephus: General . . . . .	726
24.1: The Conversion of King Izates of Adiabene to Judaism (see also 15.21) . . . . .	730
24.2: Jewish 'Sympathizers' in Josephus . . . . .	732
25: Josephus and Archaeology . . . . .	735
25.0: Josephus and the Geography, Topography, and Archaeology of the Land of Israel: General . . . . .	735
25.1: Josephus and Archaeology: Asophon . . . . .	740
25.2: Caesarea . . . . .	740
25.3: Callirrhoe . . . . .	744
25.4: Caphareccho . . . . .	744
25.5: Gaba . . . . .	745
25.6: Gerasa . . . . .	745
25.7: Herodium . . . . .	746
25.8: Jericho . . . . .	747
25.9: Jerusalem: General . . . . .	748
25.10: The Walls of Jerusalem . . . . .	753
25.11: The Antonia in Jerusalem . . . . .	757
25.12: Other Sites in Jerusalem (see also 19.16) . . . . .	758
25.13: Machaerus . . . . .	761
25.14: Masada before YADIN's Excavations of 1963-65 . . . . .	763
25.15: YADIN's Excavations of Masada . . . . .	765
25.16: The Talmud's Silence about Masada . . . . .	769
25.17: Josephus' Reliability as a Source for Masada: General . . . . .	772
25.18: Josephus' Reliability as a Source for Masada: the Speeches of Eleazar ben Jair . . . . .	777
25.19: Josephus' Reliability as a Source for Masada: the Suicide . . . . .	779
25.20: The Date of the Capture of Masada . . . . .	789
25.21: Josephus and Archaeology: the Nabataeans . . . . .	790
25.22: Tiberias . . . . .	791
25.23: Other Sites in Israel and Transjordan: Akbara (Acchabaron), Alexandrion, Amathous, 'Arâq el-Emîr, Azekus (Azeka), Ascalon, Baniyas, Besara, Emmaus, Gader, Gamla (Gamala), Geba (Gibeah), Gilgal, Golan, Hyrcania, Jotapata, Machpelah, Mambre, Meiron, Petra, Ptolemais (Akko), Salem, Samaria, Sennabris, Sepphoris, Mount Sinai, Valley of the Cilicians . . . . .	792
25.24: Sites in Lebanon and in Syria . . . . .	798
25.25: Josephus and Numismatic Evidence (see also 16.2 and 16.3) . . . . .	799

26: Vocabulary and Style . . . . .	803
26.0: Dictionaries and Concordances to Josephus . . . . .	803
26.1: Josephus' Vocabulary: Individual Words . . . . .	806
26.2: Proper Names in Josephus . . . . .	815
26.3: Josephus' Statements about His Knowledge of Greek . . . . .	817
26.4: Josephus' Language and Style . . . . .	819
26.5: Speeches and Letters in Josephus . . . . .	822
26.6: Dramatic Elements in Josephus . . . . .	825
26.7: Symbolism, Allegory, and Metaphor in Josephus . . . . .	826
26.8: References to Poetry and to Music . . . . .	826
26.9: Josephus' Literary Assistants . . . . .	827
26.10: Josephus' Grammar . . . . .	830
26.11: Hebrew as Josephus' Ancestral Language . . . . .	831
26.12: Aramaisms in the 'War' . . . . .	832
26.13: Aramaic Sources for the 'Antiquities' . . . . .	834
26.14: Josephus' Knowledge of Latin (see also 26.4) . . . . .	836
26.15: The Alleged Second Edition of the 'Antiquities' . . . . .	837
27: Josephus' Influence until the Twentieth Century . . . . .	839
27.0: Josephus' Influence: General . . . . .	839
27.1: Parallels between Josephus and the Talmud . . . . .	840
27.2: Josephus and Tacitus . . . . .	840
27.3: Parallels between Josephus and Suetonius . . . . .	843
27.4: Parallels between Josephus and Lucian . . . . .	843
27.5: Parallels between Josephus and Apuleius . . . . .	843
27.6: Parallels between Josephus and Dio Cassius . . . . .	843
27.7: Josephus' Influence on Porphyry . . . . .	844
27.8: Libanius . . . . .	845
27.9: The Church Fathers in General . . . . .	845
27.10: The Greek Hegesippus . . . . .	846
27.11: Hippolytus (see also 22.17) . . . . .	846
27.12: Origen . . . . .	847
27.13: Theophilus, Eusebius, John Chrysostom, and Pseudo-Kaisarios . . . . .	848
27.14: Minucius Felix and Tertullian . . . . .	849
27.15: Jerome . . . . .	850
27.16: Augustine . . . . .	851
27.17: Cassiodorus . . . . .	851
27.18: Coptic Literature . . . . .	851
27.19: Armenian Literature . . . . .	852
27.20: Syriac Literature . . . . .	852
27.21: Josephus' Influence during the Middle Ages Generally . . . . .	853
27.22: The Alexander Legend . . . . .	854
27.23: Particular Medieval Latin Authors in Western Europe: Bede, Rabanus Maurus, Richard of St. Victor, Peter Comestor, Fulcher of Chartres . . . . .	855
27.24: Medieval Greek Authors in Eastern Europe: George Hamartolos, Anonymus 'De obsidione toleranda', Nikephoros Kallistos Xanthopoulos, 'Palaea Historica' . . . . .	856
27.25: The Medieval Legend of Josephus the Physician . . . . .	858
27.26: Josephus' Influence on Renaissance Figures (Nicolas de Lyre, Isaac Abrabanel) and in the Reformation and post-Reformation Periods . . . . .	859
27.27: English Literature: General . . . . .	861
27.28: The Herod Theme in English Literature . . . . .	863
27.29: French Literature . . . . .	863
27.30: Italian Literature . . . . .	864

27.31: Spanish Literature . . . . .	865
27.32: The Miscellaneous Influence of Josephus: the 'Josephus Problem' in Mathematics . . . . .	868
27.33: Censorship of Josephus . . . . .	869
27.34: The Influence of Josephus on Art and Music . . . . .	869
27.35: The Influence of the Slavonic Version of the 'War' . . . . .	871
27.36: The Influence of Josippon . . . . .	872
27.37: The Influence of the Arabic and Ethiopic Versions of Josippon . . . . .	874
28: Josephus' Influence on Modern Contemporary Literature . . . . .	876
28.0: The Influence of Josephus on Modern Fiction: General . . . . .	876
28.1: Modern Fiction: FEUCHTWANGER . . . . .	876
28.2: Contemporary Novels about Herod . . . . .	878
28.3: Contemporary Novels about Masada . . . . .	878
28.4: Other Modern Fiction . . . . .	879
28.5: Contemporary Drama about Herod . . . . .	880
28.6: Contemporary Poetry and Drama about Masada . . . . .	880
28.7: Other Modern Drama . . . . .	881
28.8: Films . . . . .	882
28.9: Contemporary Politics: the Masada Complex . . . . .	882
29: Desiderata . . . . .	884
29.0: Summary and Desiderata in the Study of Josephus: Bibliography . . . . .	884
29.1: Desiderata: the Tools for Scholarship in the Field of Hellenistic-Roman Jewish History . . . . .	885
29.2: Desiderata: the Text . . . . .	886
29.3: Desiderata: the Latin, Slavonic, and Rumanian Versions; Josippon and the Arabic Version of Josippon . . . . .	887
29.4: Desiderata: Accounts of Josephus as an Historian . . . . .	888
29.5: Desiderata: Josephus and the Bible . . . . .	890
29.6: Desiderata: Spurious Works . . . . .	891
29.7: Desiderata: Josephus and Halakhah . . . . .	891
29.8: Desiderata: Josephus' Language, Style, and Literary Techniques . . . . .	892
29.9: Desiderata: the Influence of Josephus on Ancient, Medieval, and Renaissance Literature . . . . .	892
29.10: Desiderata: the Influence of Josephus on Modern Literature . . . . .	894
29.11: Desiderata: the Influence of Josephus on Modern Historiography . . . . .	895
29.12: Desiderata: the Influence of Josephus on Art and Music . . . . .	896
29.13: Desiderata: the Influence of the Slavonic Version of Josippon, and of the Arabic and Ethiopic Versions of Josippon . . . . .	896
Addenda . . . . .	899
Indices . . . . .	977
I. Index of References . . . . .	977
A. Josephus . . . . .	977
1. 'War' . . . . .	977
2. 'Antiquities' . . . . .	984
3. 'Life' . . . . .	996
4. 'Against Apion' . . . . .	997
B. Ancient and Medieval Versions of Josephus . . . . .	999
1. Hegeppus . . . . .	999
2. The Latin Translation Ascribed to Cassiodorus . . . . .	999

3. The Slavonic Version of the 'War' . . . . .	999
4. Josippon . . . . .	999
5. The Syriac Version of Book 6 of the 'War' . . . . .	999
C. Hebrew Scriptures and Septuagint . . . . .	999
D. Other Versions in Greek, Latin, and Syriac of the Hebrew Scriptures . . . . .	1002
E. Apocrypha . . . . .	1002
F. Pseudepigrapha . . . . .	1003
G. Dead Sea Scrolls . . . . .	1004
H. Samaritan Writings . . . . .	1004
I. New Testament . . . . .	1005
J. Greco-Jewish and Greco-Samaritan Writers (except Philo and Josephus) . . . . .	1006
K. Philo and Pseudo-Philo . . . . .	1007
L. Rabbinic Writings . . . . .	1008
1. Mishnah . . . . .	1008
2. Tosefta . . . . .	1009
3. Babylonian Talmud . . . . .	1009
4. Jerusalem Talmud . . . . .	1010
5. Midrashim . . . . .	1011
6. Targumim . . . . .	1011
7. Other Rabbinic Works . . . . .	1011
M. Pagan Greek Writers . . . . .	1012
N. Pagan Latin Writers . . . . .	1014
O. Tablets, Inscriptions, Papyri, Prosopography, Manuscripts, and Laws . . . . .	1016
P. Early Christian Writers in Greek . . . . .	1016
Q. Early Christian Writers in Latin . . . . .	1018
R. Medieval Writers in Arabic, Armenian, Ethiopic, Russian, and Syriac . . . . .	1018
S. Post-Talmudic Hebrew Writers until the Eighteenth Century . . . . .	1019
T. Byzantine Greek Writers . . . . .	1019
U. Medieval Latin Writers . . . . .	1020
V. Modern Literary Figures . . . . .	1020
II. Index of Words . . . . .	1022
A. Greek . . . . .	1022
B. Latin . . . . .	1028
C. Hebrew and Aramaic . . . . .	1029
D. Other Languages: Arabic, Egyptian, Hyksos, Parthian (Persian), Phoenician, Rumanian, Sumerian, Syriac, Thracian, Indo-European . . . . .	1030
III. Index of Names of Modern Writers . . . . .	1030



## 1: Introduction: General

### 1.0: Introduction

The present critical bibliography not only updates the portion of my 'Scholarship on Philo and Josephus' (1937–1962) (Yeshiva University, *Studies in Judaica*, 1; New York 1963) dealing with Josephus, but it includes numerous items omitted from that survey, as well as revisions of many comments made there.

The system of classification has been changed so as to include many more subdivisions. Each subdivision begins with a list of items, generally arranged chronologically, though modified by considerations of subject-matter, covered in that entry. Items appearing in more than one subdivision are repeated in the bibliographical entries at the beginning of every section where they appear. Some items are included in a subdivision not because of their central relevance to that subdivision but because in the course of the discussion which follows the author has had occasion to mention them. A number of items published before 1937 have been included because of their relevance to the critical discussion, though no attempt has been made to be systematic or comprehensive for this earlier work.

The present survey differs from HEINZ SCHRECKENBERG's 'Bibliographie zu Flavius Josephus' (Leiden 1968; supplement 1979) in two major respects: 1) It presents summaries and criticisms of the various items, whereas in general, SCHRECKENBERG merely lists the items and indicates the pages relevant to Josephus; 2) It is arranged according to topics and sub-topics, so that the reader may be able to see the state of the question for various aspects of Josephan scholarship, whereas SCHRECKENBERG's original bibliography is arranged by year of publication and his supplement alphabetically, without indication of the connection of the bibliographical items.

This work was completed and submitted to the editor in October, 1975, but delays were encountered in getting it into print. When this was finally assured in 1980, a supplement was clearly necessary to bring it up to date. The additional items have been included in the appropriate places and, to the extent possible, integrated with the original text.

The survey aims at completeness from 1937 through 1980, with a few items included beyond that date. The author will be grateful for information as to omissions or errors, as well as for suggestions for making it more useful.

The author wishes to acknowledge, with sincere gratitude, assistance received from the Louis and Minna Epstein Fund of the American Academy for

Jewish Research, from the Lucius N. Littauer Foundation, from the Memorial Foundation for Jewish Culture, from the American Council of Learned Societies, and from the American Philosophical Society in the pursuit of this research. He desires to thank Dr. WOLFGANG HAASE for reading the entire work and Dr. SHAYE J. COHEN and Mr. BARUCH HILL for reading portions of the manuscript and for giving many helpful suggestions.

This work is dedicated to my wife MIRIAM, who ceaselessly transmits with all her heart the sacred tradition of her martyred parents to our beloved children, Moshe, Sara, and Leah.

### 1.1: The Quantity and Languages of Josephan Scholarship

- (1) HEINZ SCHRECKENBERG: *Bibliographie zu Flavius Josephus (Arbeiten zur Literatur und Geschichte des Hellenistischen Judentums, 1)*. Leiden 1968.  
 (1a) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: *A Supplement to Heinz Schreckenberg's Bibliographie zu Flavius Josephus*. In progress.

It may be of interest to note the changes in the quantity and languages of Josephan scholarship during the present century. For the period 1909–1913 the items listed in SCHRECKENBERG (1) are in the following languages: German – 64; English – 11; French – 10; Latin – 5; Italian – 3; Arabic – 1; Dutch – 1; Modern Greek – 1. My own supplement (1a) to SCHRECKENBERG adds the following: German – 14; English – 13; French – 8; Latin – 1; Italian – 1; Hebrew – 4; Czech – 3; Spanish – 1. We thus have the following totals and percentages: German – 78 (55%); English – 24 (17%); French – 18 (13%); Latin – 6 (4%); Italian – 4 (3%); Hebrew – 4 (3%); Czech – 3 (2%); Arabic – 1 (1%); Dutch – 1 (1%); Modern Greek – 1 (1%); Spanish – 1 (1%). The total number of items for the five-year period is 141.

For the period 1961–1965 (the last five-year period for which SCHRECKENBERG attempts to be complete) SCHRECKENBERG lists items in the following languages: German – 47; English – 83; French – 17; Italian – 5; Hebrew – 7; Czech – 1; Spanish – 3; Hungarian – 3; Polish – 2; Danish – 1; Portuguese – 1. My own addenda, included in my forthcoming supplement (1a), are in the following languages: German – 24; English – 87; French – 20; Latin – 1; Italian – 11; Hebrew – 12; Spanish – 5; Hungarian – 3; Polish – 5; Modern Greek – 1; Russian – 3; Serbian – 2; Swedish – 2; Bulgarian – 1; Flemish – 1. The totals and percentages are as follows: German – 71 (20%); English – 170 (49%); French – 37 (11%); Italian – 16 (5%); Hebrew – 19 (5%); Spanish – 8 (2%); Hungarian – 6 (2%); Polish – 7 (2%); Russian – 3 (1%); Serbian – 2 (1%); Swedish – 2 (1%); Bulgarian, Czech, Danish, Flemish, Modern Greek, Latin, Portuguese – 1 each (less than 1% each). The total number of items for the five-year period is 348.

One is struck by the sheer increase – 147% – in the amount of published material and by the relative increase in the amount in English (most of it in the United States, where many universities have a ‘publish or perish’ philosophy) and the relative decrease in German, and to a lesser degree by the increase in the

amount of work in Hebrew and Italian. As one who has read almost all of this material, the present writer is reminded of the anecdote which Cicero (*Pro Archia* 10.25) tells about Sulla, who rewarded a worthless poet who had composed an epigram about him with a present of property from proscribed persons, on the condition that he should not write anything thereafter. In addition to the *Desiderata* listed at the end of this study, we may be forgiven for expressing the hope – or prayer – that one of the wealthier foundations will establish a fund to give grants on similar conditions, or, at the very least, on the condition that scholars will read what has been written in their field before they embark with pen in hand.

## 2: Bibliography

### 2.0: Bibliography of Jewish Bibliographies

- (2) SHLOMO SHUNAMI: *Bibliography of Jewish Bibliographies*. Jerusalem 1936; 2nd (thoroughly revised) ed., 1965; rpt. (with supplements) 1969.
- (2a) JOHN C. HURD, JR.: *A Bibliography of New Testament Bibliographies*. New York 1966.

SHUNAMI'S (2) revision of his standard work, containing 4727 entries, carefully subdivided as to subject-matter and with extensive indices of names, subjects, and Hebrew titles, is truly a blessing for the field of Jewish scholarship; but for Josephus we are given references to some bibliographies in books that are far less complete than some that are omitted, so that the selection seems, in some cases, almost capricious.

HURD (2a) covers the New Testament field only; but he is very incomplete for intertestamental Judaism, Philo, and Josephus (pp. 40–41).

### 2.1: General Bibliography of Hebrew Books

- (3) BERNHARD (CHAIM D.) FRIEDBERG: *Bet Eked Sefarim*. 4 vols. Tel-Aviv 1951–56.

For items printed in Hebrew, and, to some degree, in Yiddish, as well as in other languages printed in Hebrew characters during the years 1474–1950, FRIEDBERG (3) is the most complete, though not always reliable, listing to date. The work is particularly useful for listings of editions of Josippon.

### 2.2: Published Catalogues of Jewish Collections

- (4) New York Public Library: *Dictionary Catalog of the Jewish Collection*. 14 vols. Boston 1960.
- (5) Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion: *Dictionary Catalog of the Klau Library, Cincinnati*. 32 vols. Boston 1964.
- (6) CHARLES BERLIN, ed.: *Harvard University Library, Catalogue of Hebrew Books*. 6 vols. Cambridge, Mass. 1968. 3 supplementary vols., Cambridge, Mass. 1972.
- (7) United States Library of Congress: *Hebraic Title Catalogue* (unpublished card catalogue).
- (8) University of Chicago Oriental Institute: *Catalog of the Oriental Institute Library, University of Chicago*. 16 vols. Boston 1970.
- (9) Union Theological Seminary Library: *Alphabetical Arrangement of Main Entries from the Shelf List*. 10 vols. Boston 1960.

- (10) ARON FREIMANN, ed.: *Katalog der Judaica und Hebraica Stadtbibliothek Frankfurt am Main*. Frankfurt 1932; rpt. 1968.
- (11) *Livraria Ets Haim*: [Catalogue.] 7 vols. for books in Hebrew, 2 vols. for books in other languages. Amsterdam 1966.
- (12) LEVIE HIRSCHEL and M. S. HILLESUM: *Systematische Catalogus van de Judaica der Bibliotheca Rosenthaliana*. 9 fascicles. Amsterdam 1965–66. Supplement 1, Amsterdam 1971.
- (12a) RAYMOND J. TOURNAY, director: *Catalogue de la Bibliothèque de l'École Biblique et Archéologique Française* (Catalog of the Library of the French Biblical and Archeological School), Jerusalem, Israel. 13 vols. Boston 1975.
- (12b) ALEXANDER MARX: *Bibliographical Studies and Notes on Rare Books and Manuscripts in the Library of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America*, ed. MENAHEM H. SCHMELZER. New York 1977.

Of great value are the published catalogues of two of the major collections of Judaica in the world, namely, those of the New York Public Library (4) and of the Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion (5). The former, listing more items (about 270,000) than any other published catalogue of Jewish books, is particularly useful since it has separate entries for many articles in periodicals. The latter comprises about 200,000 entries.

BERLIN'S (6) Harvard University Catalogue is restricted to about 40,000 books, all in Hebrew, and hence is of particular value for editions of Josephus, the Hebrew paraphrase of the 'Jewish War', but not for the subject of Josephus in general. The same may be said for the unpublished United States Library of Congress (7) Hebraic Title Catalogue, which reflects about 75% of the Library's holdings of 104,000 Hebrew and Yiddish volumes.

Also useful, though not devoted specifically to Judaica, are the published catalogues of the University of Chicago Oriental Institute (8) and of the Union Theological Seminary Library (9).

Moreover, we possess published catalogues of the general collections of three of the major libraries of the world – the Bibliothèque Nationale, the British Museum, and the Library of Congress. The last is now being revised to include volumes in the major research libraries of the United States and Canada: this is the National Union Catalogue of pre-1956 Imprints (London 1968ff.), which numbers 685 volumes, plus (through 1981) 65 supplementary volumes (through Prikhodskii). The entries under 'Josephus' merely list editions and translations, however.

We still lack, however, published catalogues of two major collections of Judaica, namely, those of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem and of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America. Though many items in the old catalogue of the latter library are not accessible because the effects of the great fire of 1966 are still felt, the catalogue itself remains and deserves to be photographed. Bibliographical entries, however, we may note, are often less than full and frequently inaccurate.

Three smaller catalogues remain to be mentioned, that of FREIMANN (10) of the municipal library of Frankfurt, arranged alphabetically by subject and with indices, but with few entries on Josephus; that of the *Livraria Ets Haim* (11), said to be the oldest Jewish library in the world and particularly strong in

Hebrew books, which lists thirteen early editions and translations of Josephus and eleven of Josippon; and that of HIRSCHL and HILLESUM (12) of the Bibliotheca Rosenthaliana in Amsterdam, which, embracing about 30,000 items, is considerably larger than that of FREIMANN, but which is difficult to use pending the appearance of an index in the last installment. The items directly on Josephus, appearing in Fascicle 6, pp. 537–540, are relatively few and are not particularly unusual.

TOURNAY's (12a) catalogue of the École Biblique, vol. 7, pp. 345–355, contains 216 items on Josephus, mostly references to individual articles. While it is hardly complete, it does list several articles that might otherwise not be known to the student of Josephus.

The lack of a published catalogue for the Jewish Theological Seminary has, to some degree, been remedied by the reprinting of the collection of articles by MARX (12b), librarian for many years at the Seminary and the man chiefly responsible for the assembling of its magnificent collection. His annual reports concerning the library that are here reprinted list all the more important items acquired. Fortunately the volume has an extensive index which lists a number of editions and translations, notably those into Latin and into Italian, of Josephus, as well as editions of Josippon.

### 2.3: Dissertations on Jewish Subjects

- (13) WOLFDIETER BIHL: *Bibliographie der Dissertationen über Judentum und jüdische Persönlichkeiten, die 1872–1962 an österreichischen Hochschulen (Wien, Graz, Innsbruck) approbiert wurden.* Wien 1965.
- (13a) WITA RAVID and PHYLLIS DISENHOUSE, edd.: *Doctoral Dissertations and Master's Theses Accepted by American Institutions of Higher Learning, 1963–68 (Guides to Jewish Subjects in Social and Humanistic Research, 1–8).* 8 vols. New York, YIVO, 1966–78.
- (13b) WOLFDIETER BIHL: *Bibliographie der österreichischen Hochschulschriften über Judentum und jüdische Persönlichkeiten 1962–1974.* Wien 1976.

BIHL (13), who, in his brief, fifty-one-page work, subdivides the dissertations on Judaism topically, has nothing directly on Josephus; but he does list several dissertations dealing with the period of history covered by him.

RAVID (13a) has a list of dissertations in the Jewish field which, unfortunately, has many omissions. The arrangement is according to subject area, but gives only the author and title and the university which awarded the degree, with no indication of the contents or even of the date when the degree was awarded.

BIHL (13b), in his list of Austrian dissertations pertaining to Judaism, has only one item pertaining to ancient Jewish history: ALFRED SEMPER, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der jüdischen Gemeinde Palästinas in der persischen Zeit*, 2 vols. Diss., Wien 1966.

## 2.4: Indices of Jewish *Festschriften*

- (14) JACOB MARCUS and ALBERT BILGRAY: *An Index to Jewish Festschriften*. Cincinnati 1937.
- (15) CHARLES BERLIN: *Index to Festschriften in Jewish Studies*. Cambridge, Mass. 1971.

It is notorious that when articles are published in *Festschriften* they often become lost to scholarship because they are usually not part of a regular series. Hence we are particularly fortunate in the field of Judaica to have the index by article, title, and subject of MARCUS and BILGRAY (14), listing articles in fifty-three *Festschriften* up to 1936, as supplemented by BERLIN (15) up to 1970, listing articles in 243 *Festschriften*, including many issued before 1936 and missed by MARCUS and BILGRAY.

## 2.5: Annual Classical Bibliographies

- (16) JULES MAROUZEAU: *L'Année philologique: Bibliographie critique et analytique de l'Antiquité Gréco-Latine*. Vol. 1, 1924–26, Paris 1928. Most recent volume, edited by JULIETTE ERNST et al., vol. 50, 1979, Paris 1981.
- (17) ISTVÁN BORZSÁK: *A magyar klasszika-filológiai irodalom bibliográfiája 1926–50*. Budapest 1952.
- (18) GABRIELA PIANKO: *Filologia klasyczna w Polsce. Bibliografia za lata 1945–1949*. Warsaw 1952.
- (19) GABRIELA PIANKO: *Filologia klasyczna w Polsce. Bibliografia za lata 1950–1954*. Warsaw 1958.
- (20) KAREL SVOBODA: *Bibliografie českých a slovenských prací o antice za léta 1901–1950*. Prague 1961.
- (21) LADISLAV VIDMAN: *Bibliografie řeckých a latinských studií v Československu za léta 1951–1960*. Prague 1966.
- (21a) PETER A. HANSEN: *A Bibliography of Danish Contributions to Classical Scholarship from the Sixteenth Century to 1970*. *Danish Humanist Texts and Studies*, vol. 1, edited by the Royal Library, Copenhagen. Copenhagen 1977.

Many years of experience with the chief current classical bibliography, MAROUZEAU (16), '*L'Année Philologique*', have convinced the author that though its coverage has improved greatly through the years, it misses many items in the Biblical and especially the Jewish fields, as well as items in books and periodicals that are not primarily classical. Moreover, it appears about two years after the year covered in its annual bibliographies. Yet its summaries of articles in a sentence or two and its listing of reviews of books (though the latter is spotty) are invaluable aids.

'The Year's Work in Classical Studies', which appeared until 1947, contains almost nothing on Josephus.

Inasmuch as items published in smaller countries are often not covered in '*L'Année Philologique*', it is useful to have the unannotated compilations of BORZSÁK (17) for Hungarian classical publications for the years 1926–1950; PIANKO (18) (19) for Polish publications for the years 1945–1949 and 1950–1954; and SVOBODA (20) and VIDMAN (21) for Czechoslovakian publications for the years 1901–1950 and 1951–1960 respectively.

HANSEN (21a), pp. 61–62, lists six items published by Danish scholars pertaining to Josephus, with occasional descriptive notes.

## 2.6: Annual Biblical Bibliographies

- (21b) PETER NOBER, ed., *Biblica. Elenchus Bibliographicus*. Rome 1920ff.  
 (21c) *Old Testament Abstracts*. Catholic Biblical Association. 1978–present.  
 (21d) PAUL-ÉMILE LANGEVIN: *Bibliographie Biblique*, vol. 1: 1930–1970: Quebec 1972; vol. 2: Quebec 1979.

'*Biblica*' (21b), in its annual '*Elenchus Bibliographicus: XX, § 3, s. v. Philo et Iosephus*', starting in 1920, very fragmentary before 1952 but increasingly fuller since then, is particularly useful for church and, to some extent, Jewish periodicals often omitted by '*L'Année Philologique*'. But while it lists reviews of books (very spotty in this, however), it does not contain summaries of articles, and it is less than comprehensive for items in Hebrew.

A new publication, '*Old Testament Abstracts*' (21c) has appeared since February, 1978, on a thrice-yearly basis. It follows the format of the highly useful '*New Testament Abstracts*' in giving summaries of articles from a large number of journals, but it is not exhaustive.

LANGEVIN (21d), in volume 1, presents systematic analyses of articles on the Bible from seventy Roman Catholic journals. In volume 2, he goes beyond denominational criteria and includes fifty other journals (clearly far from complete coverage), as well as books, which he summarizes chapter by chapter. In particular, attention should be called to volume 1, pp. 232–235, which summarizes items pertaining to Judaism at the time of Jesus, and pp. 235–236, on Hellenism; and to volume 2, pp. 557–564, on the Jewish cultural and religious milieu of the New Testament; and pp. 564–568, on Hellenism. There are also numerous items pertaining to individual books of the Bible which comment on Josephus' treatment of these books.

## 2.7: Annual Jewish Bibliographies

- (22) ISSACHAR JOEL, ed.: *Index of Articles on Jewish Studies* (in Hebrew and English). Jerusalem 1969 (for the year 1966) ff.  
 (23) MIRIAM LEIKIND, ed.: *Index to Jewish Periodicals*. Cleveland 1963ff.  
 (23a) ELHANAN ADLER, JOSEPH YERUSHALMI, and KANIYA FLEISHER, ed.: *Index to Hebrew Periodicals 1977* (in Hebrew). 2 vols. Jerusalem, University of Haifa Center for Public Libraries in Israel, 1978.

For the Jewish field two relatively new bibliographical aids may be mentioned. The annual *Index of Articles on Jewish Studies* (22) is very incomplete for Jewish history of the period of the Second Temple and for Josephus studies generally but quite thorough for Hebrew items.

The semi-annual *Index to Jewish Periodicals* (23) covers only forty-three periodicals, all in English and mostly of a popular or a semi-popular nature.

The older annual bibliography, published since 1924 in the periodical 'Kirjath Sefer' by the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, is very spotty in its coverage of Josephus but does contain excellent reviews in Hebrew, often at great length, of important works.

ADLER, YERUSHALMI, and FLEISHER (23a), vol. 1, p. 337, list only one item under 'Josef ben Mattityahu' and one item (p. 357) under 'Josippon.'

## 2.8: Collected Bibliographies of Jewish Studies Aiming at Completeness

- (24) PETER THOMSEN, ed.: *Die Palästina-Literatur; eine internationale Bibliographie in systematischer Ordnung*. 6 vols. Berlin 1908–1956.  
 (24a) GIORGIO ROMANO: *Bibliografia Italo-Ebraica (1848–1977)* (Biblioteca di bibliografia Italiana, 88). Firenze 1979.

Among collected bibliographies which aim at completeness we may note THOMSEN (24), which in six volumes covers the period down to 1939, the latest surveying the years 1935 through 1939 (Josephus on pp. 281–288); but, as a glance at SCHRECKENBERG's bibliography for these years (as supplemented in the present work) shows, there are numerous omissions. Moreover, no attempt is made to differentiate significant from insignificant works. The author and subject indices are helpful, but an index of passages would have enhanced the work.

ROMANO (24a), pp. 135–137, 143–146, and 157, includes bibliography for items pertaining to Josephus which have been translated into Italian.

## 2.9: Selective Bibliographies Pertaining to Josephus through the Nineteenth Century

- (25) EMIL SCHÜRER: *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*. Vol. 1, 4th ed. Leipzig 1901. Pp. 102–106.  
 (26) EMIL SCHÜRER: Josephus. In: *Realencyclopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche* 9, 1901, pp. 377–386.  
 (27) JEAN JUSTER: *Les Juifs dans l'Empire romain*. Vol. 1. Paris 1914. Pp. 7–13.

Of the selective bibliographies covering the nineteenth century the best by far is that by SCHÜRER (25) in his famous work, supplemented by his article (26).

JUSTER (27), an English translation (and revision) of which is being prepared by SHAYE J. COHEN, has a good listing that supplements SCHÜRER in many places.

## 2.10: Selective Bibliographies Pertaining to Josephus for the Twentieth Century

- (29) EMIL SCHÜRER: *A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus*, ed. by NAHUM N. GLATZER. New York 1961.  
 (29) EMIL SCHÜRER: *The Literature of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus*, ed. by NAHUM N. GLATZER. New York 1972.

- (30) EMIL SCHÜRER: *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* (175 B.C.—A.D. 135), ed. by GEZA VERMES and FERGUS MILLAR. Vol. 1. Edinburgh 1973.
- (31) GUY T. GRIFFITH: *The Greek Historians*. In: MAURICE PLATNAUER, ed., *Fifty Years (and Twelve) of Classical Scholarship*. 2nd ed., Oxford 1968. Pp. 182–241.
- (32) RALPH MARCUS: *Selected Bibliography (1920–1945) of the Jews in the Hellenistic-Roman Period*. In: *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research* 16, 1946–47, pp. 97–181.
- (33) URIEL RAPPAPORT: *Bibliography of Works on Jewish History in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods, 1946–1970*. In: B. ODED et al., ed.: *Studies in the History of the Jewish People and the Land of Israel* (in Hebrew) 2. Haifa 1972. Pp. 247–321. (Originally issued in mimeographed form as: *A Selected Bibliography of Jewish History in the Period of the Second Temple*. 2nd printing with addenda, Haifa 1969).
- (34) GERHARD DELLING: *Bibliographie zur Jüdisch-Hellenistischen und Intertestamentarischen Literatur 1900–1965* (Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, 106). Berlin 1969.
- (34a) GERHARD DELLING: *Bibliographie zur Jüdisch-Hellenistischen und Intertestamentarischen Literatur 1900–1970 in Verbindung mit MALWINE MASER*, 2nd ed. (Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, 106<sup>2</sup>). Berlin 1975.
- (34b) URIEL RAPPAPORT (in collaboration with MENAHEM MOR): *Bibliography of Works on Jewish History in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods, 1971–1975*. The Institute for Advanced Studies, The Hebrew University, 1976; mimeographed, in Hebrew and English.

The first division of SCHÜRER has been issued as a paperback in an abridged English translation and contains a selected bibliography by GLATZER (28), pp. 409–416, for the years 1900–1960, good for archaeological material but spotty for historical, religious, and literary matters. A second volume edited by GLATZER (29) contains the unabridged text of SCHÜRER's volume 3 of the Second Division, to which GLATZER has added a bibliography for the years 1900–1970, primarily on the Apocrypha. In 1973 VERMES and MILLAR (30) with a number of collaborators, presented the first of three volumes of a completely revised and updated SCHÜRER, with excellent selective bibliographies for each chapter; the section on Josephus (pp. 43–61) is followed by a brief but carefully chosen bibliography, arranged according to topic. Nonetheless, the old SCHÜRER often remains useful on particular points.

In his first edition of 1954 PLATNAUER (31) had a chapter by GRIFFITH, pp. 180–192, which, though going up to Dio Cassius and Arrian, incredibly omitted Josephus completely. In the second and considerably modified edition, GRIFFITH, in a supplement of some length, gives a solitary reference to Josephus, the present author's 'Scholarship on Philo and Josephus (1937–1962).'

MARCUS (32) lists, without comment, all important books and articles (helpful for noting, with a single asterisk, those books – rarely articles – which are useful introductions, and, with a double asterisk, those books or articles that are indispensable to the specialist). The section on Josephus (pp. 178–181) shows considerable discernment; but some items of great merit are omitted, and others which are included have relatively little on the subject.

RAPPAPORT (33) is a continuation of Marcus. The subject headings have been subdivided to a much greater degree, and this feature, together with the indices, improves its usefulness. RAPPAPORT employs a single asterisk for a work which includes bibliography and a double asterisk for a work which is

itself a bibliography. The many typographical errors in the mimeographed version have been almost entirely eliminated in the printed version, but the mimeographed version does occasionally list reviews and warnings, which are totally missing in the printed version. RAPPAPORT is much less full than DELLING for the earlier period, but he is strong for the more recent period, particularly for items written in Hebrew. He is especially useful in noting works with important bibliographies. For Josephus the listing is, even for a selective bibliography, far from complete and often omits important works.

DELLING (34), like RAPPAPORT and unlike MARCUS, gives no indication of the relative importance of the items cited. The items on Josephus (pp. 51–60) are a mixed bag and include some very minor items while omitting more important ones. Rarely are reviews indicated.

DELLING (34a) has issued a new, much enlarged edition, adding about 700 items for the years 1966–1970, as well as an approximately equal number of items for the years 1900–1965 that had been omitted from the first edition. The entries on Josephus directly appear on pages 80–94. He is most helpful in listing reprints of works published before 1900, but unfortunately he omits works in Hebrew that have not been translated into European languages.

RAPPAPORT (34b) has continued his valuable, classified bibliography, with much more coverage of Josephus (pp. 51–54) than in his previous bibliographies.

### 2.11: Regularly Appearing Annotated Bibliographies of Hellenistic Judaism

(34c) *Internationale Zeitschriftenschau Bibelwissenschaft und Grenzgebiete*, ed. F. STIER. Düsseldorf 1951ff.

(34d) *New Testament Abstracts*, ed. DANIEL J. HARRINGTON. Cambridge, Mass. 1956ff.

(34e) *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period*, ed. ADAM S. VAN DER WOUDE. Leiden 1970ff.

(34f) *Revue de Qumran*, ed. JEAN CARMIGNAC. Paris 1958ff.

(34g) *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, ed. GEORG FOHRER. Berlin 1881ff.

(34h) *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, ed. EDUARD LOHSE. Berlin 1900ff.

The 'Internationale Zeitschriftenschau' (34c) contains very brief summaries of articles under the headings 'Geschichte Israels: Exil bis Bar Kochba' and 'Judentum: Philo-Josephus'.

'New Testament Abstracts' (34d) contains somewhat fuller summaries of articles, as well as of books, together with summaries of important reviews of books. Its coverage is the most comprehensive and most prompt (and ever expanding) for articles, and, to a lesser degree, for books in the field of Hellenistic Judaism.

The fullest summaries for individual items will be found in the 'Journal for the Study of Judaism' (34e), which, however, covers far fewer periodicals.

The 'Revue de Qumran' (34f), which appears at somewhat irregular intervals, lists, in most issues, books, dissertations, and articles pertaining to the Dead Sea Scrolls, but without summaries.

The 'Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft' (34g) and the 'Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft' (34h) have very brief summaries of articles in a limited number of periodicals.

The summaries in all of these journals are rarely critical.

### 2.12: Brief Selective Bibliographies of Hellenistic Judaism

- (35) HAROLD R. WILLOUGHBY: *The Study of the Bible Today and Tomorrow*. Chicago 1947. Pp. 32–51.
- (36) JUDAH GOLDIN: *On a Selective Bibliography in English for the Study of Judaism*. In: CHARLES J. ADAMS, ed., *A Reader's Guide to the Great Religions*. New York 1965. Pp. 191–228.
- (37) RICHARD BAVIER: *Judaism in New Testament Times*. In: RICHARD BAVIER et al., *The Study of Judaism: Bibliographical Essays*. New York 1972. Pp. 7–34.
- (38) MARCEL SIMON and ANDRÉ BENOIT: *Le Judaïsme et le Christianisme antique d'Antiochus Épiphane à Constantin* (*Nouvelle Clio*, 10). Paris 1968.
- (38a) WERNER BAIER: *Liturgie und Kult in der frühjüdischen Welt und Umwelt*. In: *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 19, 1978, pp. 175–192.
- (38b) GÜNTER MAYER: *Zur jüdisch-hellenistischen Literatur*. In: *Theologische Rundschau* 44, 1979, pp. 197–226; 45, 1980, pp. 226–244.

The work of WILLOUGHBY (35), which discusses briefly six books on Josephus, none of which appeared after 1932, is disappointing. GOLDIN's brief work (36) is a highly selective, fair, critical bibliography of the major works in the general field of Judaism and includes Josephus as well. BAVIER (37) has highly selective summaries, but is skimpy in his coverage and is almost never critical. A work that includes MILTON STEINBERG's novel 'As A Driven Leaf' while omitting the 'Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum' of TCHERIKOVER, FUKS, and STERN cannot be taken seriously. The first third of SIMON-BENOIT (38) consists of a comprehensive bibliography, giving first the primary sources, including archaeological, epigraphic, numismatic, and literary sources, followed by a general bibliography, often with brief descriptive notes and warnings as to bias.

BAIER (38a) contains descriptions and evaluations of about a paragraph, often highly critical, for each of 125 books dealing with worship in Hellenistic Judaism under four categories: *Festschriften*, histories of the period, archaeology, and writers (including Josephus) and religious movements of the period.

MAYER (38b) surveys a number of recent series of volumes dealing with Hellenistic Judaism and comments, in particular, on fragments of Hellenistic Jewish literature quoted by Josephus and others. In his second survey he includes nine books on Josephus.

### 2.13: Specialized Bibliographies in Areas Covered by or Related to Josephus: the Septuagint

- (39) SEBASTIAN P. BROCK, CHARLES T. FRITSCH, SIDNEY JELLCOE: *A Classified Bibliography of the Septuagint*. Leiden 1973.

Inasmuch as for the first half of the 'Antiquities' Josephus' chief source is the Bible, especially in the Septuagint version, bibliographies of the Septuagint often deal with Josephus' value for determining the text of the Septuagint and the relationship of Josephus' text to the Lucianic version which he seems to anticipate. We now have BROCK-FRITSCH-JELLICOE (39), which lists (pp. 58–59) the major contributions on the theme of Josephus' Septuagint down to 1969; but it omits several works that deal with the subject directly and numerous works that deal with this matter less directly, particularly for the period before 1900, even though it claims to include everything or nearly everything of importance.

#### 2.14: Specialized Bibliographies: the New Testament

- (40) GEORGE S. GLANZMAN and JOSEPH A. FITZMYER: *An Introductory Bibliography for the Study of Scripture* (Woodstock Papers, no. 5). Westminster, Maryland, 1961; rev. ed., Rome 1981.
- (41) WILLIAM N. LYONS and MERRILL M. PARVIS, ed.: *New Testament Literature: An Annotated Bibliography*. Vol. 1. Chicago 1948.
- (42) BRUCE M. METZGER: *Index to Periodical Literature on Christ and the Gospels*. Leiden 1966.
- (43) ANDREW J. MATTILL and MARY B. MATTILL: *A Classified Bibliography of Literature on the Acts of the Apostles*. Leiden 1966.
- (44) BRUCE M. METZGER: *Index of Articles on the New Testament and the Early Church Published in Festschriften* (*Journal of Biblical Literature Monograph Series*, 5). Philadelphia 1951; supplement, Philadelphia 1955.
- (44a) FRÉDÉRIC MANNS: *Bibliographie zu Judéo-Christianisme* (*Studium Biblicum Franciscanum Analecta*, 13). Jerusalem 1979.

For the Jewish Scriptures and especially for the New Testament GLANZMAN and FITZMYER (40) have valuable, impartial annotations of two or three sentences about each work, with frequent warnings to the reader; but there is little directly on Josephus.

LYONS and PARVIS (41) seek to present an exhaustive bibliography on the New Testament and related fields which appeared in the years from 1943 to 1945, plus items that appeared in 1940–1942 which were not included in earlier publications. For Josephus only eight items are mentioned, with occasional summaries: the work is clearly very incomplete.

METZGER (42) includes (pp. 387–389) an entry on Josephus and the Gospel tradition, dealing especially with the 'Testimonium Flavianum' (Ant. Jud. 18. 63–64) and, to a lesser degree, with the relationship of Luke and Josephus. His bibliography on these subjects is, however, far from complete.

MATTILL and MATTILL (43) have a classified bibliography dealing only with Acts; the section dealing with Josephus' relation with Acts is relatively complete but still has a number of omissions.

For the many articles on or alluding to Josephus in New Testament-oriented *Festschriften* we are indebted to METZGER (44), but he has missed several where the references to Josephus are not apparent from the title.

MANNS (44a) lists 1914 items on the literary sources of Jewish Christianity, general treatments of the subject, theology, exegesis, archaeology, and Christianity in its milieu.

### 2.15: Specialized Bibliographies: Philo

- (45) ERWIN R. GOODENOUGH: *The Politics of Philo Judaeus, Practice and Theory, with a General Bibliography of Philo* by HOWARD L. GOODHART and ERWIN R. GOODENOUGH. New Haven 1938; rpt. Hildesheim 1967.
- (46) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: *Scholarship on Philo and Josephus (1937–1962)* (Yeshiva University, *Studies in Judaica*, 1). New York 1963.
- (47) EARLE HILGERT: *A Bibliography of Philo Studies, 1963–1970*. In: *Studia Philonica* 1, 1972, pp. 57–71.
- (48) EARLE HILGERT: *A Bibliography of Philo Studies in 1971, with Additions for 1963–70*. In: *Studia Philonica* 2, 1973, pp. 51–54.
- (48a) EARLE HILGERT: *A Bibliography of Philo Studies, 1972–1973*. In: *Studia Philonica* 3, 1974–75, pp. 117–125.
- (48b) EARLE HILGERT: *A Bibliography of Philo Studies, 1974–1975*. In: *Studia Philonica* 4, 1976–77, pp. 79–85. [See *infra*, p. 899.]

Since Josephus is the only Jewish author who mentions Philo until the sixteenth century and inasmuch as there is good reason to believe that Philo had direct or indirect influence on Josephus both in the ‘Antiquities’ and especially in ‘Against Apion’, bibliographies of Philo sometimes contain references to this relationship. The standard bibliography by GOODHART and GOODENOUGH (45), which has no comments but which does list many but far from all reviews, misses many of the works that discuss this relationship.

My own critical bibliography (46) continues from the point where GOODHART and GOODENOUGH end; on it see my corrigenda in ‘*Studia Philonica*’ 1, 1972, p. 56.

HILGERT (47) (48) covers the period from 1963 to 1971 but without comments; and issues of ‘*Studia Philonica*’ starting with volume 2 contain abstracts of articles on Philo. If, all in all, one will find relatively few references to correspondences between Philo and Josephus it is because the subject remains largely unexplored.

HILGERT (48a) (48b) brings his bibliography up through 1975. This is a mere listing, though unusually complete. The issues of ‘*Studia Philonica*’ elsewhere give paragraph-long summaries of some of the items.

### 2.16: Specialized Bibliographies: the Essenes, the Dead Sea Scrolls, and the Slavonic Josephus (see also 22.10)

- (49) SIEGFRIED WAGNER: *Die Essener in der wissenschaftlichen Diskussion vom Ausgang des 18. bis zum Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts. Eine wissenschaftliche Studie*. Berlin 1960.
- (50) GÖSTA LINDESKOG: *Die Essenerfrage in Geschichte und Gegenwart*. In: *Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute* 1, 1962, pp. 96–108.
- (51) WILLIAM S. LASOR: *Bibliography of the Dead Sea Scrolls, 1948–1957* (*Fuller Library Bulletin*, no. 31). Pasadena, California 1958.
- (52) CHRISTOPH BURCHARD: *Bibliographie zu den Handschriften von Toten Meer (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 76 and 89)*. Vol. 1, nr. 1–1556, Berlin 1957; vol. 2, nr. 1557–4459, Berlin 1965.
- (53) MICHAEL YIZHAR: *Bibliography of Hebrew Publications on the Dead Sea Scrolls 1948–1964* (*Harvard Theological Studies*, 23). Cambridge, Mass. 1967.

- (54) BASTIAAN JONGELING: *A Classified Bibliography of the Finds in the Desert of Judah, 1958–1969* (JOHANNES VAN DER PLOEG, ed., *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah*, vol. 7). Leiden 1971.
- (55) JAMES A. SANDERS: *Palestinian Manuscripts 1947–1967*. In: *Journal of Biblical Literature* 86, 1967, pp. 431–444.
- (56) JAMES A. SANDERS: *Palestinian Manuscripts 1947–1972*. In: *Journal of Jewish Studies* 24, 1973, pp. 74–83.
- (57) HERBERT BRAUN: *Qumran und das Neue Testament*. 2 vols. Tübingen 1966.
- (58) HANS BARDTKE: *Qumran und seine Probleme*. In: *Theologische Rundschau* 33, 1968, pp. 97–119.
- (59) ROBERT EISLER: *The Messiah Jesus* (trans. into English by ALEXANDER H. KRAPPE of his *IHCOYC BACIAEYC OY BACIAEYCAC*). London 1931. Pp. 624–630. (Cf. below, no. [81].)
- (59a) ANTONIO G. LAMADRID: *Los descubrimientos del Mar Muerto. Balance de veinticinco años de hallazgos y estudio*. Madrid 1971.
- (59b) ALFRED ADAM, ed.: *Antike Berichte über die Essener*, 2nd ed. by CHRISTOPH BURCHARD. Berlin 1972.
- (59c) JAMES A. SANDERS: *The Dead Sea Scrolls – A Quarter Century of Study*. In: *Biblical Archaeologist* 36, 1973, pp. 109–148.
- (59d) JOSEPH A. FITZMYER: *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Major Publications and Tools for Study* (*Sources for Biblical Study*, no. 8; Society of Biblical Literature). Missoula, Montana 1975.
- (59e) HERBERT HAAG: *Kult, Liturgie und Gemeindeleben in Qumran*. In: *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 17–18, 1975–76, pp. 222–239.

The section in Josephus, *Jewish War* 2. 119–161, which is the chief source of our knowledge of the Essenes, has been subject to a tremendous discussion, the most important items of which have been summarized and extensively appraised by WAGNER (49), who notes the trends in the scholarship until the year 1947, when the Dead Sea Scrolls were first discovered. LINDESKOG (50) continues where WAGNER ends and discusses the Essenes in the light of these new finds.

The continuing discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls since 1947 has led to a vast bibliography documented in almost every issue of *Revue de Qumran* since 1958 and collected by LASOR (51), BURCHARD (52), and YIZHAR (53). LASOR, covering the period to 1957, has a long but far from exhaustive section (pp. 71–73: nos. 3100–3154) on the Essenes, for whom Josephus is the chief source and with whom the Dead Sea Sect has been identified by many scholars.

JONGELING (54) continues at the point where LASOR ends, but he has not sufficiently subdivided the subject into classifications, has many omissions, and lacks annotation.

The most comprehensive bibliography, that by BURCHARD (52), in his first volume, embracing 1556 items, covers the period to 1957; his second, with 2902 items, reaches 1962. Unfortunately articles in modern Greek and in Hebrew (the latter often the most significant ones) are in separate sections. There is regrettably no classification according to topics but rather only according to the particular Qumran text being commented upon, an unfortunate arrangement, since so many of the articles deal with several of the texts.

SANDERS (55) (56) presents lists of where photographs and responsible transcriptions of the Dead Sea manuscripts have been published, as well as a brief

list of study aids. SANDERS' second publication follows the format of his first but rectifies the order of manuscripts found in Caves 4 and 11.

YIZHAR (53) has almost three hundred items in Hebrew, unknown to many Western scholars, arranged according to subject, with many entries accompanied by brief descriptive notices.

An extensive classified bibliography on the Essenes, particularly in relation to the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament, will be found in BRAUN (57).

BARDTKE (58) presents a survey of the scholarship, particularly of the previous decade, dealing with the scrolls, and especially with the problem of whether to identify the sect with the Essenes or with the Zealots.

On the Slavonic Josephus there is a very full bibliography, especially on the passages referring to Jesus and John, in EISLER (59).

I have not seen LAMADRID's (59a) analysis of the first quarter of a century of scholarship on the Dead Sea Scrolls.

ADAM's (59b) bibliography on the Essenes has been brought up to date by BURCHARD, who is particularly concerned with the relationship of the Essenes to the Dead Sea Sect.

SANDERS (59c) presents a critical analysis of the literature on the Dead Sea Scrolls. He summarizes (pp. 125–127) Josephus' references to the Essenes.

FITZMYER (59d) has a bibliography which is very useful, being selective and classified.

HAAG (59e) summarizes a number of books and articles that appeared during 1969–1971 under the topics of bibliography, texts, the origin and organization of the Qumran community, the identification of the Dead Sea Sect with the Essenes, the celibacy and asceticism of the Sect, their theology, and the relation of the Sect to Christianity.

## 2.17: Specialized Bibliographies: Bibliographies of Individual Scholars

(60) SIDNEY B. HOENIG: Solomon Zeitlin: Scholar Laureate. New York 1971.

Among scholars who have devoted attention to Josephus, SOLOMON ZEITLIN, controversial though he be, must be counted among the most original and the most provocative. The tribute edited by his pupil HOENIG (60) contains, in addition to chapters sympathetically evaluating ZEITLIN's contributions to various fields, brief uncritical summaries of 406 items published by ZEITLIN between 1915 and 1970, almost all of them dealing with the period of the Second Temple.

## 2.18: Bibliographies Devoted Specifically to Josephus

(61) FRIEDRICH REUSS: Bericht über die griechischen Historiker: Josephus. In: Bursian, Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft 142, 1909, pp. 159–163.

- (62) ALBERT DEBRUNNER: Bericht über die Literatur zum nachklassischen Griechisch aus den Jahren 1907–1929. In: Bursian, Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft 236, 1932, p. 197: Josephus und Philo.
- (63) HEINZ SCHRECKENBERG: Bibliographie zu Flavius Josephus (Arbeiten zur Literatur und Geschichte des Hellenistischen Judentums, 1). Leiden 1968.
- (64) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: Scholarship on Philo and Josephus (1937–1962) (Yeshiva University, Studies in Judaica, 1). New York 1963.
- (65) RALPH MARCUS, ed. and trans.: Josephus, vol. 6, Jewish Antiquities, Books IX–XI (Loeb Classical Library). Cambridge, Mass. 1937.
- (66) RALPH MARCUS, ed. and trans.: Josephus, vol. 7, Jewish Antiquities, Books XII–XIV (Loeb Classical Library). Cambridge, Mass. 1943.
- (67) RALPH MARCUS and ALLEN WIKGREN, edd. and trans.: Josephus, vol. 8, Jewish Antiquities, Books XV–XVII (Loeb Classical Library). Cambridge, Mass. 1963.
- (68) LOUIS H. FELDMAN, ed. and trans.: Josephus, vol. 9, Jewish Antiquities, Books XVIII–XX (Loeb Classical Library). Cambridge, Mass. 1965.
- (68a) URIEL RAPPAPORT: Josephus Flavius: A Help Manual for Class (in Hebrew). Haifa (Haifa University) 1971.
- (68b) ARTHUR A. CHIEL: The Kohut Judaic Collection at Yale. In: JONATHAN D. SARNA, ed., Jews in New Haven. New Haven, Jewish Historical Society, 1978. Pp. 80–94.
- (68c) HEINZ SCHRECKENBERG: Bibliographie zu Flavius Josephus: Supplementband mit Gesamtregister (Arbeiten zur Literatur und Geschichte des hellenistischen Judentums, vol. 14). Leiden 1979.
- (68d) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: A Supplement to Heinz Schreckenberg's Bibliographie zu Flavius Josephus. In progress.

The last critical survey in the Jahresbericht series is by REUSS (61) and covers the years 1905–1908. On the language of Josephus the most recent survey is by DEBRUNNER (62) covering the years 1907–1929, which is far from attaining its goal of complete coverage.

We must all be grateful to SCHRECKENBERG (63) for his year-by-year listing starting with 1470, the year of the *editio princeps*, to 1968, with systematic coverage through 1965. For most items SCHRECKENBERG gives brief, though almost never critical, summaries. He classifies the items according to a scheme of twenty-five categories, far too few for a bibliography as vast as that of Josephus; thus, for example, one category encompasses the entire area of historical personalities and events, another Josephus' views on Judaism, etc. Many items are left unclassified, either because the author had not seen them or could not find a niche for them within his scheme. Many are left without any summary of contents. As it stands, the bibliography is useful for the student of the history of Josephan scholarship, since it shows the direction which studies have taken through the years. But most modern scholars find an arrangement by subject matter, such as is employed by DOUGLAS E. GERBER, *A Bibliography of Pindar 1513–1966* (Philological Monographs of the American Philological Association, no. 28; Cleveland 1969), more useful. SCHRECKENBERG seldom lists reviews, except for a few of the longest and most important ones. Moreover, on related subjects, such as Hegesippus and Josippon (Josephon), works are sometimes, but not systematically, included. The reader will find numerous question marks, particularly for the older entries, indicating that the author was unable to verify the entries. While it is true, as the greatest of Jewish bibliographers MORITZ

STEINSCHNEIDER once remarked, that such works are terminated only by the binder, it is disappointing to note that there are numerous errors in the entries, as well as in the otherwise useful indices of names and passages, and many hundreds of omissions which the present author has compiled and which await publication. In sum, if the criteria of a bibliography are completeness, accuracy, and ease of consultation, this bibliography does not meet optimum standards.

My own bibliography (64), though limited in years covered, because of its arrangement by subject matter and its critical appraisals, is hopefully easier to use, especially for those not thoroughly acquainted with the field. Though it attempted to be complete, there were numerous omissions, which the present work seeks to remedy.

In the last four volumes of the Loeb series there are selective bibliographies on a number of subjects. In volume 6 MARCUS (65) has bibliographies on the Samaritan schism (Ant. 11. 297–347) and on Alexander the Great and the Jews (Ant. 11. 317–345), as well as detailed critical discussions of the literature.

In volume 7 MARCUS (66) has selective bibliographies and critical discussions of the date of the High Priest Simon the Just (the Righteous), the early Seleucid rulers and the Jews, and Antiochus III and the Jews (Ant. 12. 129–153). There are also bibliographies without comment on the Oniads and Tobiads and Palestine under Ptolemaic rule (Ant. 12. 154–236), Spartans and Jews (Ant. 12. 226–227, 13. 164–170), the background of the Maccabean revolt, the Seleucid Era in I and II Maccabees and the chronology of the Hasmonean period, Antiochus Epiphanes and the Samaritans (Ant. 12. 257–264), the Hellenistic and Roman decrees in Antiquities 12–14, the Hasmoneans in rabbinic tradition, the status of Judaea under Roman rule 63–37 B. C. E., and Hasmonean coinage.

MARCUS and WIKGREN (67) in volume 8 have a general bibliography for the period covered in Antiquities 15–17, as well as a selective, briefly annotated bibliography on Herod the Great's building program; these bibliographies unfortunately contain numerous errors in citations and sometimes include items of only the most marginal relevance while omitting others of much greater significance.

In volume 9 (68) I have included selective bibliographies on the following subjects: Quirinius' assessment (Ant. 18. 1), the Pharisees and the Sadducees (Ant. 18. 12–17), the Essenes (Ant. 18. 18–22), the Fourth Philosophy (Ant. 18. 23–25), the Samaritans (Ant. 18. 29–30, 85–87, etc.), the Roman procurators (except Pontius Pilate) (Ant. 18. 31–35, etc.), Parthian affairs (Ant. 18. 39–52, etc.), the incident of the Emperor's standards (Ant. 18. 55–59), Pontius Pilate, especially his dismissal from the procuratorship (Ant. 18. 60–62, 85–89), the "Testimonium Flavianum" (Ant. 18. 63–64), the expulsion of the Jews by Tiberius (Ant. 18. 65–84), the death of John the Baptist (Ant. 18. 116–119), Agrippa I (Ant. 18. 143ff.), the Emperor Gaius' dealings with the Jews (Ant. 18. 257ff.), the sources of Book 19, the citizenship of the Alexandrian Jews and Claudius' edict (Ant. 19. 280–285), the conversion of King Izates and the Adiabeniensians to Judaism (Ant. 20. 17–96), and the high priests during the first century of the Christian Era (Ant. 18. 26ff. and especially 20. 224–251). I have

prefixed a double asterisk to those items indispensable for the specialist and a single asterisk to those works presenting an especially good introductory survey.

RAPPAPORT (68a) has a selected bibliography for a course in Josephus.

CHIEL (68b), p. 92, comments on the remarkable addition made to the Yale University Library in 1915 of the impressively sizable collection of 1500 volumes pertaining to Josephus that had been personally acquired by Dr. SELAH MERRILL, United States consul in Jerusalem.

SCHRECKENBERG (68c) has brought his bibliography up to date (there are few entries after 1977), including numerous items for the period until 1966 that he had omitted in his previous bibliography. He uses the same method of classification; but instead of a year-by-year bibliography he has arranged all items alphabetically and has separated text editions and items of fiction based on Josephus, as well as items pertaining to the versions, from his main list. The descriptions of the items vary greatly in length and value, and for some items there is no description at all. SCHRECKENBERG is of particular value in noting references to particular passages in Josephus that are discussed. He has corrected a number of errors in his previous edition, but many still remain; and, despite all his efforts, he has omitted many items, though few of major importance. There are combined indices for the authors in chronological order and in alphabetical order. It is most unfortunate, however, that SCHRECKENBERG has omitted indices of citations and of Greek words, such as he has in his original bibliography.

The bibliography which I (68d) am compiling continues where SCHRECKENBERG ends. It also includes numerous items omitted by SCHRECKENBERG both in his original bibliography and in his supplement. An attempt has been made to make the summaries more systematic than those in SCHRECKENBERG.

### 3: The Text

#### 3.0: Editions of the Greek Text

- (69) BENEDICT NIESE, ed.: *Flavii Iosephi opera*. 7 vols. Berlin 1885–95; rpt. 1955 (= *editio maior*)
- (70) BENEDICT NIESE, ed.: *Flavii Iosephi opera*. 6 vols. Berlin 1888–95 (= *editio minor*).
- (71) SAMUEL A. NABER, ed.: *Flavii Iosephi opera omnia post IMMANUELEM BEKKERUM*. 6 vols. Leipzig 1888–96.
- (72) HENRY ST. JOHN THACKERAY, RALPH MARCUS, ALLEN WIKGREN, LOUIS H. FELDMAN, edd. and trans.: *Josephus*, 9 vols. Cambridge, Mass. (Loeb Classical Library), 1926–65.
- (73) HEINZ SCHRECKENBERG: *Neue Beiträge zur Kritik des Josephustextes*. In: *Theokratia* 2, 1970–72, pp. 81–106.
- (74) ABRAHAM SCHALIT, ed.: *Documents for the History of the Diaspora in the Period of the Second Temple from the 'Antiquitates Judaicae'*, Books 14–16. Jerusalem 1957.
- (75) KOSTAS I. PHRINLINGOS: *Φλαβίου Ἰωσήπου Κατ' Ἀπίωνος*. Athens 1939.
- (76) ROBERT J. H. SHUTT: *Reconstruction of the Greek Text of Contra Apionem* 2. 51–113 (unpublished).
- (76a) VICTOR EHRENBERG and ARNOLD H. M. JONES, edd.: *Documents Illustrating the Reigns of Augustus and Tiberius*. Oxford 1949.

The standard editions of Josephus remain those that were issued almost simultaneously by NIESE (69)(70) and NABER (71). The former has a much fuller apparatus criticus in his *editio maior*; and indeed both NABER and the Loeb edition of THACKERAY et al. (72) depend upon it. It is close to the manuscript tradition and is generally, and with good reason, more widely accepted. It should be noted, nevertheless, that NIESE's *editio minor* (70) changes the text of the *editio maior* (69) in several hundred passages, though often it is unnecessarily bold; it rates, nevertheless, as NIESE's final edition. NIESE, however, in line with the prevailing principle in text criticism of his time, overestimated the value of one group of manuscripts, for example RO for Antiquities 1–10, and frequently failed to consider the quality of individual readings case by case. Consequently, all too often, as SCHRECKENBERG (73) remarks, the best textual tradition appears in NIESE's apparatus.

NABER's (71) text may be smoother generally than that of NIESE, especially when compared with the latter's *editio maior*, but the task of the editor, of course, is to reconstruct what Josephus wrote rather than to improve his Greek. NABER's edition, and especially his apparatus criticus, are, moreover, full of errors.

So far as the Greek text is concerned, the Loeb version of THACKERAY et al. (72) is not only derived from NIESE but is often unreliable in doing so,

especially in citing the Epitome. Under MARCUS and FELDMAN the Loeb edition did, however, incorporate a number of emendations; and, in any case, in notes much fuller than those found in THACKERAY's volumes, they often explain the reasons for their choice of readings.

SCHALIT (74) presents, without comment or translation, portions of the Greek text of documents in Books 14–16 of the 'Antiquities' to illustrate the lectures in his seminar at the Hebrew University.

PHRINLINGOS (75) has an edition of the Greek text of 'Against Apion', together with an introduction, translation into modern Greek, and commentary.

SHUTT (76) has reconstructed the Greek, using Josephus' idiom and language, for the passage in 'Against Apion' (2. 51–113) which has survived only in the Latin version. Inasmuch as the Latin translation misunderstood the Greek in a number of places, this translation is especially valuable in reconstructing the original text.

EHRENBERG and JONES (76a), pp. 129–135, have the Greek texts, without commentary, of Antiquities 16. 162–165, 166, 167–168, 169–170, 171, and 172–173.

### 3.1: Transmission of the Text

- (77) ABRAHAM SCHALIT, trans.: Joseph ben Mattityahu, Kadmoniot Hayyehudim (trans. into Hebrew of 'Antiquities'). Vol. 3 (Books 11–20). Jerusalem 1963.
- (78) HEINZ SCHRECKENBERG: Neue Beiträge zur Kritik des Josephustextes. In: *Theokratia* 2, 1970–72, pp. 81–106.
- (79) SHLOMO PINES: An Arabic Version of the Testimonium Flavianum and Its Implications (Publications of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities: Section of Humanities). Jerusalem 1971.
- (80) HEINZ SCHRECKENBERG: *Die Flavius-Josephus-Tradition in Antike und Mittelalter*. Leiden 1972.
- (81) ROBERT EISLER: *IHCOYC BACIAEYC OY BACIAEYCAC*, Die messianische Unabhängigkeitsbewegung vom Auftreten Johannes des Täufers bis zum Untergang Jakobus des Gerechten nach der neuerschlossenen Eroberung von Jerusalem des Flavius Josephus und den christlichen Quellen. Mit Abbildungen einer Auswahl der unveröffentlichten altrussischen Handschriften und anderer Urkunden, einer Erstausgabe der wichtigsten slavischen Stellen nach Abschriften von ALEXANDER BERENDTS und VASSILYI ISTRIN, sowie den Überresten des rumänischen Josephus übersetzt von MOSES GASTER. Vol. 1. Heidelberg 1929.
- (82) FRANZ BLATT: *The Latin Josephus*. Vol. 1: Introduction and Text, *The Antiquities*, Books I–V (*Acta Jutlandica* 30.1, Humanistic Series 44). Aarhus and Copenhagen 1958.
- (83) ROBERT DEVREESE: *Les anciens commentateurs grecs de l'Octateuque et des Rois* (Fragments tirés des Chaînes). Città del Vaticano 1959.
- (84) CHRISTOPH BURCHARD: Zur Nebenüberlieferung von Josephus' Bericht über die Essener Bell 2, 119–161 bei Hippolyt, Porphyrius, Josippus, Niketas Choniates und anderen. In: OTTO BETZ, KLAUS HAACKER, MARTIN HENGEL, edd., *Josephus-Studien: Untersuchungen zu Josephus, dem antiken Judentum und dem Neuen Testament*, Otto Michel zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet. Göttingen 1974. Pp. 77–96.
- (85) ROBERT M. GRANT: Notes on the Text of Theophilus, Ad Autolyicum III. In: *Vigiliae Christianae* 12, 1958, pp. 136–144.

- (86) OTTO MICHEL: Zur Arbeit an den Textzeugen des Josephus. In: Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 83, 1971, pp. 101–102.
- (87) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: Evidence of an Aramaic Source in Josephus' 'Antiquities of the Jews'. In: Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute 4, 1965, pp. 163–188.
- (87a) W. HÖRANDMER, rev.: HEINZ SCHRECKENBERG, Die Flavius-Josephus-Tradition in Antike und Mittelalter. In: Gnomon 47, 1975, pp. 708–710.
- (87b) HEINZ SCHRECKENBERG: Rezeptionsgeschichtliche und Textkritische Untersuchungen zu Flavius Josephus. Leiden 1977.
- (87c) SHLOMO PINES: An Arabic Version of the Testimonium Flavianum and Its Implications (Publications of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities: Section of Humanities). Jerusalem 1971.
- (87d) ANDRÉ-M. DUBARLE: Le témoignage de Josèphe sur Jésus d'après la tradition indirecte. In: Revue Biblique 80, 1973, pp. 481–513.
- (87e) CHRISTOPH BURCHARD: Die Essener bei Hippolyt. Hippolyt, Ref. IX 18, 2–28, 2 und Josephus, Bell. 2, 119–161. In: Journal for the Study of Judaism 8, 1977, pp. 1–41.
- (87f) ANDRÉ PELLETIER: Flavius Josèphe: Guerre des Juifs, Livre I. Paris 1975.
- (87g) TESSA RAJAK, rev.: ANDRÉ PELLETIER, Flavius Josèphe: Guerre des Juifs, Livre I. In: Classical Review 28, 1978, pp. 20–22.

SCHALIT (77), p. viii, remarks, though not without a touch of exaggeration, that the text of Josephus' 'Antiquities' is more corrupt than any other Greek text. It is in much worse shape than one would gather from NIESE's *editio maior*, though NIESE in his preface says that if he had waited to restore every corruption the edition would have been delayed indefinitely.

SCHRECKENBERG (78) comments that an extensive collation of new manuscripts would increase the massive apparatus of NIESE's *editio maior* only insignificantly, with only a slight chance here and there of localizing the genuine tradition. To be sure, further work on the manuscripts will help to further refine NIESE's stemma, which is extremely complex because Josephus was so widely read and copied.

A possible clue to the unreliability of the text that we possess may be found in the fact that Origen (*Contra Celsum* 1. 47, 2. 13 end; *Commentary on Matthew* 10. 17), Eusebius (*Historia Ecclesiastica* 2. 13. 20) and Jerome (*De Viris Illustribus* 13) declare that Josephus said that Jerusalem was destroyed because of the murder of James the Just, a statement nowhere to be found in our text of Josephus. Similarly, as PINES (79) has noted, there are statements in the tenth-century Arabic historian Agapius allegedly drawn from Josephus which are not in our texts. These may, of course, be due to interpolations or loose paraphrasing, but they may also refer to a different text.

Inasmuch as Josephus is writing in a language which is still foreign for him, and inasmuch as he appears not to have had assistants for most of the 'Antiquities', as he did for the 'War', we are often reduced to finding what a writer not thoroughly familiar with the language would have written. The corruption in the text of the first half of the 'Antiquities', where he paraphrases the Bible, has been aggravated by the tendency of copyists to assimilate Josephus' text to that of the Septuagint, particularly in the spelling of proper names.

SCHRECKENBERG's study (80) of the transmission of the text of Josephus from the autograph to the *editio princeps* is in preparation for a new edition to replace NIESE. In it he lists, with annotations, the manuscripts of Josephus, as

well as those who cite or quote excerpts from him. Inasmuch as during the Middle Ages Josephus' works were transmitted by Christians who sometimes subjected him to interpolation and censorship, the history of this transmission is of great importance. But SCHRECKENBERG generally does not include those who used Josephus second- or third-hand, since he rejects such Byzantine chronologists as those cited by EISLER (81) as worthless; yet he includes some Byzantine writers who probably knew Josephus only second- or third-hand. Moreover, he has not been exhaustive in citing the Church Fathers and later writers; he mentions but does not recognize, for example, as a citation of the 'Testimonium Flavianum' Jerome's *De Viris Illustribus* 13. A spot check of a single passage, *Antiquities* 1. 70–71, indicates that SCHRECKENBERG has omitted references of some merit in John of Antioch and in Joel's 'World-Chronicle', as well as in the 'Eklogē Chronikōn' (CRAMER, *Anecdota Paris* 2. 233). SCHRECKENBERG has also omitted the translations and paraphrases of Josephus, which are often more ancient than any of our extant Greek manuscripts. In particular we need a thorough account of the transmission of the Latin version of Josephus, since BLATT's (82) discussion is definitely deficient; for, as SCHRECKENBERG himself admits, the Latin version is frequently most helpful in determining the Greek text. The next edition should also make fuller use of the Greek Epitome than did NIESE.

Inasmuch as the text tradition was apparently polarized into two families as early as the third century, a close study of the testimonia in the Church Fathers should prove rewarding in enabling us to trace the beginnings of this polarization. DEVREESSE (83) notes four passages from the 'Antiquities' (1. 193, 1. 238, 2. 253, 5. 227) and one from the 'War' (5. 217) cited in anthologies and in fragmentary works of the Church Fathers, most of which SCHRECKENBERG (80) has omitted and which may be of some value for reconstructing the text.

SCHRECKENBERG (80) asserts that it is most unlikely that a second edition will account for variations in the text transmission. This, we may comment, seems a valid conclusion, since one would expect that in a second edition Josephus would have made more major revisions than mere minor changes of phraseology.

BURCHARD (84) traces the text tradition of the citations by later writers, notably Hippolytus, Porphyry, Josippus, and Niketas Choniates, of the passage concerning the Essenes in *War* 2. 119–161, constructs a stemma showing their relations, and discusses their value for reconstructing the text. He notes that the great majority of the texts go back either to Hippolytus or to Porphyry.

GRANT (85) notes that in *Ad Autolyicum* 3. 20–22 Theophilus follows Manetho and Menander of Ephesus as cited in *Against Apion* 1. 94–103 and 1. 117–126. Such citations, we may remark, may help us greatly in restoring the text of Josephus, especially when they represent unintelligent copying of Josephus, as in Theophilus.

MICHEL (86) has rightly noted the importance of SCHALIT's (87) article discovering a Semitic phrase behind the Greek in *Antiquities* 18. 343; and he suggests, citing *War* 1. 2 and 1. 65 as examples, that this should be extended to the 'War'. MICHEL is in doubt whether this Semitic influence goes back to an

older transmission or is secondary; but inasmuch as Josephus himself says (War 1. 3) that he originally composed the 'War' in Aramaic, it would be most helpful to retranslate it back into Aramaic in order to get clues as to the original text and to the meaning of the text, just as similar retranlations of the Gospels into Aramaic have sometimes been helpful in understanding the words of Jesus.

HÖRANDMER (87a) notes that SCHRECKENBERG (80) has omitted a number of manuscripts containing short fragments of Josephus.

SCHRECKENBERG (87b) admits that NIESE's stemmata are basically sound but challenges NIESE's undue reliance on one family of manuscripts. He urges full collation of Yale MS. 275 and Bononiensis gr. 3568. He concludes, however, that only through corrections and conjectures will the text be improved materially, and he gives numerous individual instances of such corrections. In general, these conjectures are closer to the manuscripts than are those made by SCHRECKENBERG in 'Theokratia'. We may add, however, that the work of PINES (87c) and DUBARLE (87d) on the 'Testimonium Flavianum' and of BURCHARD (87e) on Josephus' notices concerning the Essenes shows how much can be done for the text of Josephus through a study of the text tradition of those writers who quote or paraphrase Josephus. One major achievement of SCHRECKENBERG is a new insight into the stylistic and linguistic unity of the works of Josephus, and a direct challenge to THACKERAY's theory that Josephus used assistants in composing part of his 'Antiquities'.

PELLETIER (87f) presents a valuable survey of the transmission of Josephus' text, especially by Eusebius. The value of these citations for establishing the text is minor, however, since PELLETIER admits that Eusebius deliberately introduced changes.

RAJAK (87g) protests against what she calls the millenarianism in Josephus studies which has led scholars to hope for a perfect text of Josephus based upon a thorough consideration of every variant reading in all the manuscripts. She disagrees with the protests of some reviewers of NIESE that the text has been tampered with radically and that it is thoroughly corrupt. We may comment that a distinction must be made as to the degrees of corruption in various parts of Josephus. The text of the 'War' is in considerably better shape than that of the 'Antiquities'; and for the 'Antiquities' certain books, notably Book 18, are undoubtedly in worse shape than others.

### 3.2: Studies of Individual Manuscripts and of Early Printed Editions

- (88) HANS OELLACHER: *Griechische Literarische Papyri II*. Baden bei Wien 1939.
- (89) HEINZ SCHRECKENBERG: *Die Flavius-Josephus-Tradition in Antike und Mittelalter*. Leiden 1972.
- (90) ALFRED W. POLLARD and GILBERT R. REDGRAVE, ed.: *A Short Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland and Ireland and of English Books Printed Abroad, 1475-1640*. London 1926; 2nd ed., 1976.
- (91) HERBERT C. ZAFREN: *Printed Rarities in the Hebrew Union College Library*. In: *Studies in Bibliography and Booklore* 5, 1961, pp. 137-156.

- (91a) FRANÇOISE PETIT: *Catena Graecae in Genesim et in Exodum*, vol. 1: *Catena Sinaitica* (Corpus Christianorum, series Graeca, 2). Brepols-Turnhout 1977.
- (91b) GEORGES-J. WEILL: *Catalogue des manuscrits de la bibliothèque, Tome I: Manuscrits judaïca (non hébraïques)* no. 103 à 522. Paris 1979.

What we would like, of course, would be papyri containing large portions of Josephus; but thus far we have found only one brief fragment, Papyrus Graeca Vindobonensis 29810, dating from the late third century, including War 2. 576–579, 582–594, published by OELLACHER (88) and commented upon by SCHRECKENBERG (89), pp. 54–55. Unfortunately the fragment is in a poor state of preservation, so that I have counted only 38 words in it which are complete and only 74 which are extant in part. The fact, however, that there are nine places (several of them, to be sure, based on somewhat shaky conjectures deriving from the number of letters in a line) where the fragment differs with all the manuscripts collated by NIESE leads us to conclude that the text of the ‘War’, which is in much better shape than that of the ‘Antiquities’, is even less secure than we had supposed. None of the changes in the papyrus involve important differences in meaning in the text; but the fact that the papyrus (though it is, of course, dangerous to draw conclusions on the basis of so very short a passage) agrees now with one group of manuscripts (PAM) and now with another (VRC) leads one to suggest, as does SCHRECKENBERG (74), that it is dangerous to rely excessively, as did NIESE, on the PAM group.

POLLARD and REDGRAVE (90) comment on the first edition of Josephus’ works in Greek printed in England, which was published in 1590 with a Latin interpretation by JOHN LUIDI at Oxford.

ZAFREN (91), pp. 144–146, cites early editions of Josephus in the Hebrew Union College Library.

PETIT (91a) remarks that the Sinai Manuscript has a number of notes, eight of which are drawn from Josephus through Eusebius of Emesa, Diodorus of Tarsus, and Eusebius of Caesarea.

WEILL (91b), p. 49, 355 A, lists *Chroniques tirées de Flavius Josèphe et de Tabari, Histoire des Califes*, from the nineteenth century.

### 3.3: Textual criticism

- (92) IDA MIÉVIS: *Apropos de la correction Thallos dans les Antiquités de Fl. Josèphe*. In: *Revue Belge de Philologie et d’Histoire* 13, 1934, pp. 733–740.
- (93) HORACE A. RIGG, JR.: *Thallus the Samaritan?* In: *Harvard Theological Review* 34, 1941, pp. 111–119.
- (94) GEORGE C. RICHARDS and ROBERT J. H. SHUTT: *Critical Notes on Josephus’ Antiquities*. In: *Classical Quarterly* 31, 1937, pp. 170–177; and 33, 1939, pp. 180–183.
- (95) VINZENZ BULHART: *Iosephus, Antiq. ix, 17*. In: *Mnemosyne IVa Ser.* 6, 1953, p. 230.
- (96) ANTONIO GARZYA: *Varia Philologica IV, 2: Flavio Giuseppe, Autobiogr. 74*. In: *Bolletino del Comitato per la Preparazione dell’Edizione nazionale dei Classici greci e latini* (Supplemento to *Rendiconti della Classe di Scienze Morali, Storiche e Filologiche dell’Accademia dei Lincei, Roma*) 9, 1961, p. 42.
- (97) ANDRÉ PELLETIER, ed. and trans.: *Josephus, Autobiographie*. Paris 1959.

- (98) SVEN LUNDSTRÖM: Josephus, Contra Apionem II, 233. In: *Eranos* 51, 1953, pp. 99–100.
- (99) GIUSEPPE GIANGRANDE: Emendations to Josephus Flavius' Contra Apionem. In: *Classical Quarterly* 12, 1962, p. 108–117.
- (100) HEINZ SCHRECKENBERG: Einige Vermutungen zum Josephustext. In: *Theokratia* 1, 1967–69, pp. 64–75.
- (101) HEINZ SCHRECKENBERG, rev.: ROBERT J. H. SHUTT, Studies in Josephus. In: *Gnomon* 35, 1963, pp. 28–31.
- (102) HEINZ SCHRECKENBERG: Neue Beiträge zur Kritik des Josephustextes. In: *Theokratia* 2, 1970–72, pp. 81–106.
- (102a) ANTONIO PIÑERO SÁENZ: Nota crítica a Antiq. IV 118 de Flavio Josefo. In: *Emerita* (Madrid) 44, 1976, pp. 121–128.

ΜΙΕΪΣ (92) corrects ἄλλος (Ant. 18. 167) not to Θάλλος (HUDSON'S emendation) but to ἄνθρωπος. But RIGG (93) does well in keeping the manuscript reading ἄλλος, which he has translated as a pronoun, "another."

RICHARDS and SHUTT (94) offer a large number of emendations for the various books of the 'Antiquities' based primarily on the Latin version, which is at least five or six centuries older than our earliest Greek manuscript. If one may judge from the emendations offered for Books 18–20, which I have considered with some care, these suggestions are often far afield and almost never worth adopting.

BULHART (95) reads λήματος for κτήματος (Ant. 9. 17), an emendation that is not really necessary.

GARZYA (96) argues against the preference for manuscript R shown by PELLETIER (97) and attempts to show that this manuscript's reading of χρίσονται in Life 74 is inferior.

LUNDSTRÖM (98) relies on grammatical parallels and on the Latin version in keeping the reading λόγον . . . παραβιασθεῖεν (Against Apion 2. 233).

GIANGRANDE (99) offers emendations for Against Apion 1. 139, 1. 236, 1. 307, 2. 23, 2. 131, and 2. 215, which generally have palaeographical probability and semantic appropriateness.

SCHRECKENBERG (100) offers 35 emendations: for War 1. 657, 4. 510, 6. 257, 7. 143–144; Antiquities 1. 170, 1. 267, 2. 32, 5. 98, 6. 67, 6. 180, 6. 363, 7. 36, 7. 105, 7. 287, 8. 165, 8. 215, 8. 244, 8. 269, 9. 39, 11. 89, 15. 139–140, 15. 333–334, 17. 50, 17. 265, 17. 347, 18. 201, 19. 30, 19. 52, 19. 212, 19. 218, 20. 66–67, 20. 90, 20. 263; Life 153, 208. His suggestions uniformly improve the sense, grammar, and style of Josephus, but all that this proves is that Josephus' Greek is not as good as SCHRECKENBERG'S; and, indeed, Josephus' text is full of passages which a good assistant might well improve. But is this the function of an editor? To be sure, SCHRECKENBERG always cites parallels for his emendations; and especially when these are based on the Latin version and on Josephus' usage elsewhere, as SCHRECKENBERG was able to perceive from the concordance being prepared by him and others, they are often attractive. Yet, such an emendation as the correction of ἀναλαβών to λαβών in Antiquities 20. 263, proposed originally in SCHRECKENBERG'S review (101) of SHUTT, is based upon the fact that ἀναλαβών in the sense of "memorized" is unusual, that the phrase ἐμπειρίαν λαβών is found in Life 10, and that the error could easily occur through

dittography. Yet the use of ἀναλαβών in the sense of “learn by rote” is found in Josephus’ contemporary Plutarch, as well as in Arrian and Alexander Aphrodisiensis in the following two centuries. Of SCHRECKENBERG’s emendations only that on Antiquities 17. 50 (ἀν ἡδίων) is both necessary and palaeographically probable. Antiquities 19. 212 (κατελιημένος) is transcriptionally probable and definitely improves the sense. The emendation on Antiquities 11. 89 is palaeographically probable, is paralleled, and definitely improves the sense, but it is still not absolutely necessary. Antiquities 7. 287 (ἔλεον) and 8. 244 (εἶδεν) are attractive and satisfactory from a palaeographical point of view but are not really necessary. Antiquities 17. 347 (ἔαρος) is unsatisfactory in sense and not too likely palaeographically. The emendation of Antiquities 20. 90 is ungrammatical. The other passages are generally improved in sense, but the emendations are often not too probable palaeographically.

SCHRECKENBERG (102) comments on textual readings in War 1. 37, 1.174, 1. 365, 1. 378, 2. 303, 2. 486, 3. 290, 3. 341, 3. 400–401, 3. 460, 4. 79, 4. 460, 4. 573, 4. 656, 5. 367, 5. 462, 5. 572, 6.211, 6. 352, 6. 414, 7. 149, and 7. 259. Here, too, SCHRECKENBERG makes good use of the concordance being issued under the editorship of KARL H. RENGSTORF and in which SCHRECKENBERG has played a key role; but, as he himself has noted, there is danger in the use of the concordance, since Josephus wrote over a long period of time and his style changed considerably, particularly, we may add, as he became more familiar with the Greek language, on the one hand, and less dependent upon assistants, on the other. All in all, coming from the man who is likely to be the next editor of the Greek text of Josephus and who certainly has the qualifications for the task, these sample emendations must be termed disappointing. At the foundation of SCHRECKENBERG’s emendations is his adoption of BRUNO SNELL’s principle that the more corrupt a text the more one has the right and indeed the duty, through conjecture, to disregard what violates the rules. But if we had an exhaustive grammar of the Greek language as Josephus knew it and if we noted carefully differences in usage between the ‘War’ and the ‘Antiquities’ we might be more reluctant to emend him.

I have not seen SÁENZ (102a), who has a critical note on Antiquities 4. 118. [See *infra*, p. 900.]

## 4: Translations into Modern Languages

### 4.0: Translations (with or without Commentaries) into English

- (103) WILLIAM WHISTON, trans. Josephus. Complete Works. Philadelphia 1957.
- (104) WILLIAM WHISTON, trans.: Josephus. Complete Works (forward by WILLIAM S. LASOR). Grand Rapids, Mich. 1960.
- (105) WILLIAM WHISTON, trans.: Josephus. Complete Works (introductory essay by H. STEBBING). New York 1961.
- (106) LEWIS BROWNE, ed.: The Wisdom of Israel. New York 1945.
- (107) WILLIAM HERSEY DAVIS and EDWARD A. McDOWELL: A Source Book of Interbiblical History. Nashville 1948.
- (108) SALO W. BARON and JOSEPH L. BLAU, edd.: Judaism: Postbiblical and Talmudic Period. New York 1954.
- (109) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: rev. of SALO W. BARON and JOSEPH L. BLAU, edd., Judaism: Postbiblical and Talmudic Period. In: Classical Weekly 49, 1955–56, pp. 132–134.
- (110) CHARLES K. BARRETT: The New Testament Background: Selected Documents. London 1956; New York 1961, 1966.
- (111) NAHUM N. GLATZER, ed.: The Rest Is Commentary. A Source Book of Judaic Antiquity. Boston 1961. Reprinted as Part I of his The Judaic Tradition. Boston 1969.
- (112) NAHUM N. GLATZER, ed.: Jerusalem and Rome. New York 1960; London 1966.
- (113) ROBERT TRAILL, trans.: The Works of Flavius Josephus, ed. ISAAC TAYLOR. 2 vols. London 1847–51.
- (114) NAHUM N. GLATZER, ed.: The Second Jewish Commonwealth: From the Maccabean Rebellion to the Outbreak of the Judaeo-Roman War. New York 1971.
- (115) WILLIAM R. FARMER, ed.: Flavius Josephus: The Great Roman-Jewish War: A.D. 66–70 (the WILLIAM WHISTON translation as revised by DAVID S. MARGOLIOUTH, including "The Life of Josephus"). New York 1960.
- (116) RALPH MARCUS, ed. and trans.: Josephus, vol. 6, Jewish Antiquities, Books IX–XI (Loeb Classical Library). London and Cambridge, Mass. 1937.
- (117) RALPH MARCUS, ed. and trans.: Josephus, vol. 7, Jewish Antiquities, Books XII–XIV (Loeb Classical Library). London and Cambridge, Mass. 1943.
- (118) RALPH MARCUS and ALLEN WIKGREN, edd. and trans.: Josephus, vol. 8, Jewish Antiquities, Books XV–XVII (Loeb Classical Library). London and Cambridge, Mass. 1963.
- (119) LOUIS H. FELDMAN, ed. and trans.: Josephus, vol. 9, Jewish Antiquities, Books XVIII–XX (Loeb Classical Library). London and Cambridge, Mass. 1965.
- (120) MOSES I. FINLEY, ed.: HENRY ST. J. THACKERAY and RALPH MARCUS, trans.: Flavius Josephus. The Jewish War and Other Selections. New York 1965.
- (121) ALFRED H. TAMARIN, ed.: Revolt in Judea: The Road to Masada: The eyewitness account by Flavius Josephus of the Roman campaign against Judea, the destruction of the Second Temple, and the heroism of Masada. New York 1968.
- (122) LOUIS H. FELDMAN, rev.: ALFRED H. TAMARIN, Revolt in Judea. In: Classical World 64, 1970–71, pp. 29–30.

- (123) HOWARD C. KEE: *The Origins of Christianity. Sources and Documents*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey 1973.
- (124) MICHAEL A. MEYER, ed.: *Ideas of Jewish History*. New York 1974.
- (125) GEOFFREY A. WILLIAMSON, trans.: *Josephus: The Jewish War*. Baltimore 1959.
- (126) LOUIS H. FELDMAN, rev.: GEOFFREY A. WILLIAMSON, *Josephus: The Jewish War*. In: *Classical World* 53, 1959–60, pp. 164–165.
- (127) GEOFFREY A. WILLIAMSON, trans.: *Flavius Josephus: The Destruction of the Jews*. London 1971.
- (128) ABRAHAM WASSERSTEIN, ed.: *Flavius Josephus: Selections from His Works*. New York 1974.
- (129) ROBERT J. H. SHUTT: *Selections from Josephus*. Leiden. In progress.
- (129a) AZRIEL EISENBERG, HANNAH G. GOODMAN, and ALVIN KASS, edd.: *Eyewitnesses to Jewish History from 586 B.C.E. to 1967*. New York 1973. Pp. 45–49: *Josephus Views the Sacking of the Second Temple*, 70 C.E.

For over two hundred years the most widely known translation of Josephus into English or, for that matter, any other language has been that of WILLIAM WHISTON, originally published in 1737. According to SCHRECKENBERG's 'Bibliographie zu Flavius Josephus', it has been reprinted or re-edited 132 times. I have found 85 additional reprintings. It was this version that occupied a place on the shelf of literate English-speaking persons between the Jewish Scriptures and the New Testament until it was displaced in this century by the Loeb Classical Library, and in many homes it has lasted until the present day. The translation has undoubted virility, but not only is it based on an inferior text, that of HAVERKAMP (issued in 1726), but it is full of inaccuracies.

A. R. SHILLETTO (London 1890) claims to have improved upon WHISTON by correcting errors in scholarship and by simplifying the English style. But this revision must be termed a disappointment, for SHILLETTO has kept too much of WHISTON. In his notes, moreover, WHISTON has some strange ideas, notably that Josephus was not only an Ebionite Christian but that he was also bishop of Jerusalem.

DAVID S. MARGOLIOUTH's revision of WHISTON (London 1906) is, like SHILLETTO's, unsatisfactory in not revamping WHISTON to a greater degree.

WHISTON's version has been reissued less frequently in recent years because of the supremacy quickly attained by the Loeb version, but it has been reprinted (103) in 1957 (not MARGOLIOUTH's revision, as asserted by SCHRECKENBERG, *Bibliographie*, p. 45, but the original WHISTON); with a foreword, generally favorable to the personality of Josephus, by LASOR (104); and with an old introductory essay by STEBBING (105).

Among selections from Josephus in WHISTON's translation may be noted BROWNE (106), pp. 138–144, an anthology of Jewish literature with three extracts from Josephus (*War* 1. 372–382 and *Against Apion* 2. 204–218, 291–295), whom he terms a Roman quisling with a troubled conscience; DAVIS and McDOWELL (107), containing numerous extracts from Josephus in SHILLETTO's revision of WHISTON, but with no notes or introductions; BARON and BLAU (108), containing brief selections from Josephus (see my review, 109), available as a paperback; and BARRETT (110), containing selections, especially dealing with Jewish history of the period, with very brief introductions and notes,

a biography of Josephus, and discussions of Josephus on Jesus, Josephus as an apologist, and the Slavonic Josephus.

GLATZER (111) contains (pp. 138–153) selections from *Against Apion* 2. 145–295, and selections from the account of Masada (*War* 7. 341–406) in WHISTON-SHILLETO's edition, with a minimum of very brief notes. In another volume (112) GLATZER presents the general reader with a continuous history of Judaea from 134 B.C.E. to 73 (74) C.E. through a series of brief selections from Josephus' own writings, notably the 'War', with brief introductory comments connecting the passages. While taking TRAILL's (113) translation of the 'War' and WHISTON-SHILLETO's of the 'Antiquities' as his basis, GLATZER has revised them considerably. The result is generally readable (though not quite up to the standard of WILLIAMSON's Penguin version) (125) and usually accurate. GLATZER (114) has also edited a translation of WHISTON as revised by SHILLETO of *Antiquities* 12. 154 to the end of the 'Antiquities', with a select bibliography.

MARGOLIOUTH's revision of WHISTON's translation of the 'War' and of the 'Life' has been published as a Harper Torchbook paperback (New York 1960; rpt. Gloucester, Mass. 1970), with a disappointingly brief and superficial introduction by FARMER (115) on 'Josephus and the Axial Age of History' and another cursory prefatory note on 'Josephus, the Slavonic Fragments, and the Dead Sea Scrolls' by NAHUM N. GLATZER.

The Loeb Library Version in nine volumes bases its text primarily on NIESE, but the editors have frequently exercised independent judgment. MARCUS' volume 6 (116) has an accurate and readable translation, though it lacks somewhat the felicity and vigor of THACKERAY's earlier volumes in the series. MARCUS, however, excels THACKERAY in the fullness of his critical apparatus and of his explanatory notes; he is particularly helpful in citing parallels in rabbinic literature. MARCUS' volume 7 (117) has linguistic and historical notes that are even fuller. Volume 8 (118) appeared after MARCUS' death; it is not up to the standard of volume 7 so far as the accuracy and helpfulness of its commentary is concerned.

My volume 9 (119) also contains a general index to all of Josephus. The following corrigenda should be noted: p. 13, line 10: For townsfolk read masses; p. 172, line 4: For σῆ read σῆ; p. 195, line 1: correct the font of the second quotation mark after "man"; p. 330, line 18: For Μᾶρκος read Μάρκος; p. 330, Apparatus Criticus, note 5: For MW: Μᾶρκον A read M: Μάρκον AWE; p. 371 (marginal summary): "An example of Agrippa's forgiving nature" (in some copies the second, third, and fourth lines of this caption are crooked); p. 386, line 14: For σφαλεῖρον ναι read σφαλερὸν εἶναι; p. 465, line 5: For to whom he read to whom his father; p. 518, Apparatus Criticus, note 3, line 2: For Βαζαφαρμάνης Phot. p. 318 read Βαζαφαρμάνης Phot. p. 318; p. 560, line 2: For philosophers read philosophies; p. 562, line 27: After pp. 268–322. add 1925; p. 586, line 3: For Proselytizing read Proselyting; p. 618, column 1, lines 9–10: For xiv. 41, 91; xx. 234 read xiv. 91; xx. 251; p. 621, col. 1, line 14: After xiv. 389 add; Herod's sons Alexander and Aristobulus stay at his home, xv. 343; p. 624, col. 1, line 47: after xviii. 32–33; add: sends Thesmusa to Phraates as a gift, xviii. 40; p. 634, col. 2, lines 17–18: after xvi. 162; omit: sends Thesmusa to Phraates as a gift, viii. 40; p. 650, col. 2, line 27: For 305, 311 read 305; inquires

of G-d concerning the war, vii. 311; p. 655, col. 1, line 19: For Egypt ns read Egyptians; p. 656, col. 2, line 3: Omit 169; p. 656, col. 2, line 4: For 171 read 169; p. 662, col. 1, line 42: For 373 read 373–378; p. 690, col. 2, line 3: Omit parentheses after Herodium; p. 693, col. 2, line 49: For Antipater read Antigonus; p. 698, col. 1, line 13: For Phiabi read Phabi; p. 710, col. 1, line 12: Jesus (14): Add: perhaps to be identified with Jesus (11); p. 712, col. 2, line 48: For ii. 285 read ii. 585; p. 718, col. 1, line 6: For 422 read 423; p. 728, col. 1, line 45: After iv. 205 add: assist magistracies, iv. 214; p. 737, col. 1, lines 33–34: For 283–287 read 283–287; records (i. e. omit Menander [2] of Ephesus and run that entry together with Menander [1], who is identical); p. 753, col. 2, line 41: The entry Pentephres should be divided into two entries thus: Pentephres (1) (var. Petephres; Bibl. Potiphar), an Egyptian, A. ii. 39, 49; Joseph falsely accused before him by his wife, ii. 54–58; ii. 78. Pentephres (2) (Bibl. Poti-pha), priest of Heliopolis, ii. 91; p. 761, col. 2, line 29: For presumably read presumably; p. 762, col. 1, line 29: For xiv. 29 read A. xiv. 29; p. 762, col. 1, line 33: For xiv. 38–39, 46–47 read xiv. 41–46; p. 762, col. 2, line 27: For 61 read 64; p. 784, col. 1, line 2: For A. xx. 122 read A. xix. 365; xx. 122, 176; p. 786, col. 2, line 2: For Aristeus read Aristeas; p. 790, col. 2, line 4: For [2] read [3]; p. 795, col. 2, line 35: For [13] read [14]; p. 812, col. 1, line 17: For ii. 651 read ii. 444, 564, 651.

Among selections from the Loeb translation we may note FINLEY (120), who has edited and abridged and provided an introduction to the 'Jewish War', as well as other selections. TAMARIN (121) (see my review) (122) has abridged, with some rewriting, THACKERAY'S version of the 'War'; but there is no indication as to what has been omitted or rewritten. He shows no awareness of the controversies as to whether Josephus' account may be trusted and as to whether Masada's defenders were heroes or cowards. TAMARIN has, moreover, introduced some errors into the translation which are not found in his source, THACKERAY. He apparently did not consult the original Greek in compiling the work. He errs also in asserting that the Roman soldier who tore the Torah was handed over to the Jews, whereas actually he was beheaded by Cumanus (Ant. 20. 117). The book is lavishly illustrated.

KEE'S (123) collection of texts includes passages from the 'Antiquities' and the 'War' in the Loeb version, with brief introductions and comments. MEYER (124), pp. 52–63, includes selections in the Loeb translation from the prefaces to the 'War' (1. 1–30) and the 'Antiquities' (1. 1–25) with very brief introductions and notes.

The translation by WILLIAMSON (125) is especially commendable for its simple, contemporary idiom. It makes Josephus more readable by relegating his digressions to footnotes or appendices (see my review) (126). A new hardback edition of WILLIAMSON'S translation (127) has now appeared with beautiful and striking engravings by GARRICK PALMER but omitting the history of the Jews from Antiochus Epiphanes to Archelaus.

WASSERSTEIN (128) has edited a judiciously chosen group of selections in WHISTON'S translation but revised by himself in many places, together with a fine introduction and brief but helpful notes. He has preferred selections illus-

trating the political, religious, and cultural history of the Jews to those dealing with military or topographical details.

SHUTT (129) has informed me by letter that he has compiled a volume of selections from Josephus, with introductions to each of Josephus' works and a fresh translation and notes as necessary, which is to be published by Brill.

EISENBERG, GOODMAN, and KASS (129a) present WHISTON's translation of selections from Josephus' account of the destruction of the Temple (War 6. 249ff.), together with a brief introduction on Josephus's life and works. Their conclusion is that Josephus' history does not meet modern scientific standards but that he was a learned man.

#### 4.1: Translations (with or without Commentaries) into French

- (130) ARNAULD D'ANDILLY, trans.: Flavius Josèphe. Histoire ancienne des Juifs et La guerre des Juifs contre les Romains, 66–70 après J.-C. Autobiographie. Textes . . . adaptés en français moderne par J. A. C. BUCHON. Preface de VALENTIN NIKIPROWETZKY. Paris 1968.
- (131) THÉODORE REINACH, ed.: Oeuvres complètes de Flavius Josèphe. 7 vols. Paris 1900–32.
- (132) ANDRÉ PELLETIER, trans.: Flavius Josèphe: Autobiographie (Collection des Universités de France, publiée sous le patronage de l'Association Guillaume Budé). Paris 1959.
- (133) ANDRÉ PELLETIER, trans.: Flavius Josèphe: Guerre des Juifs, I: Livre I (Collection des Universités de France, publiée sous le patronage de l'Association Guillaume Budé). Paris 1975. II: Livres II et III. Paris 1980.
- (133a) PIERRE SAVINEL, trans.: Flavius Josèphe. La guerre des juifs. Précédé de Du bon usage de la trahison by PIERRE VIDAL-NAQUET. Paris 1977.

What WHISTON has been to the English-speaking world D'ANDILLY has been to the French, though he has hardly gone through as many editions. The most recent edition, adapted into modern French, is by BUCHON (130) with a brief preface by NIKIPROWETZKY. BUCHON's revision, made in 1836, does not take into account the advances of the nineteenth century in arriving at Josephus' text.

The excellent translation into French edited under the direction of THÉODORE REINACH (131) is often drawn upon by THACKERAY in his Loeb volumes for the rabbinic learning which its notes contain, though MARCUS considerably surpasses it in this respect. It is complete except for the 'Life', a lack which has just been remedied by ANDRÉ PELLETIER's translation (132) in the Budé series, containing the Greek text (marred by a number of misprints) and a translation (containing a number of errors), introduction (containing nothing novel) and notes (largely dependent upon THACKERAY's Loeb edition). PELLETIER (133) is preparing a text and another translation of the 'War', of which Books 1–3 have appeared. His translation is adequate but hardly distinguished. He continues to be largely dependent upon THACKERAY's Loeb edition for his notes. His notes and excursus disregard many significant scholarly works.

I have not seen SAVINEL (133a). [See *infra*, p. 900.]

## 4.2: Translations (with or without Commentaries) into German

- (134) HEINRICH CLEMENTZ, trans.: Des Flavius Josephus Jüdische Altertümer. 2 vols. Halle 1899; rpt. Köln 1959.
- (135) HEINRICH CLEMENTZ, trans.: Flavius Josephus, Geschichte des Jüdischen Krieges. Halle 1900; rpt. Köln 1959, Wiesbaden 1977.
- (136) HEINRICH CLEMENTZ, trans.: Des Flavius Josephus kleinere Schriften (Selbstbiographie – Gegen Apion – Über die Makkabäer). Halle 1900; rpt. Köln 1960.
- (137) HEINRICH CLEMENTZ, trans. and HEINZ KREISSIG, introduction and notes: Flavius Josephus, Geschichte des Jüdischen Krieges. Leipzig 1970, 1974.
- (138) OTTO MICHEL and OTTO BAUERNFEIND, trans.: Flavius Josephus. De bello judaico. Der jüdische Krieg. Griechisch und Deutsch. vol. 1 (books 1–3) Bad Homburg, Darmstadt 1959; 2nd ed., 1962; vol. 2.1 (books 4–5) München, Darmstadt 1963; vol. 2.2 (books 6–7) Darmstadt 1969; vol. 3 (with T. HIRSCH) (Ergänzungen und Register) München 1969.
- (139) HERMANN ENDRÖS, trans.: Flavius Josephus. Der jüdische Krieg. De Bello Judaico. 2 vols. München 1965–66, 1974.
- (140) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: Commentary on *Antiquities* (in progress).
- (141) BENJAMIN MURMELSTEIN, ed.: Flavius Josephus. Lebenslauf, Jüdische Altertümer, Geschichte des Jüdischen Krieges, Widerlegung des Apion von Alexandrien. Wien 1938.
- (142) KURT GALLING, ELMAR EDEL, RIEKELE BORGER: Textbuch zur Geschichte Israels. Tübingen 1950; 2nd ed., 1968.
- (143) CHARLES K. BARRETT: Die Umwelt des Neuen Testaments. Ausgewählte Quellen (Trans. by CARSTEN COLPE of: The New Testament Background: Selected Documents. London 1956). (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 4). Tübingen 1959.
- (144) JOHANNES LEIPOLDT and WALTER GRUNDMANN, ed.: Umwelt des Urchristentums, II: Texte zum neutestamentlichen Zeitalter. Berlin 1967.
- (145) HERMANN ENDRÖS, ed.: Der jüdische Krieg (De bello judaico, Teilausg. dt.). Auswahl. (Goldmanns gelbe Taschenbücher, Bd. 2481). München 1969.

CLEMENTZ' translations (134) (135) (136), which have been reprinted without change, are far below the scholarly standard of the Loeb edition in English or the REINACH edition in French and have very inadequate notes. A more recent re-issue of CLEMENTZ (137) has an introduction and notes by KREISSIG.

MICHEL and BAUERNFEIND (138) have issued, in three volumes, the Greek text (based on NIESE) of the 'War' with a competent German translation on opposite pages. The apparatus criticus and notes are somewhat briefer, particularly for the first books (usually containing only cross-references), than those of the Loeb edition, but the notes are of particular interest because they avail themselves so greatly of the Dead Sea Scrolls. There are, moreover, twenty-five excursus, averaging two pages in length, on the following individual points of the text, particularly in Books 6 and 7: Acra (Book 1. 39, 50); the Herodian buildings in Jericho (Book 1, passim); the eagle on the Temple in Jerusalem (1. 648–655); transgression of law by the Zealots (παράνομία) (4. 154); the "Zealots" in Josephus, War 4 (4. 161); the "Idumaeans" in Josephus, War 4 (4. 224); Simon bar Giora (4. 512); the site of Jerusalem (5. 136ff.); the citadel of Herod (5. 181); the citadel of Antonia (5. 247); the bronze shekel of the "Year 4 of the Redemption" (5. 555); the teaching of Josephus concerning the soul (6. 48); the East Gate of the inner Temple precinct (6. 292); the significance

of the "sign" of Josephus (6. 299); the χρησιμὸς ἀμφίβολος and its significance (6. 312); the special legal situation of the Jews (6. 335); the population of Jerusalem without pilgrims and strangers (6. 386); the idea of τύχη in Josephus (6. 413); Jerusalem after the destruction of 70 C.E. (7. 20); the description of the triumphal procession according to Josephus (7. 130); the problem of the Sicarii and the relationship of the revolutionary groups to one another (7. 253); the analysis of the Masada episode, War 7. 252–406 (7. 271); the archaeological discoveries in their relationship to the report of Josephus on the Roman siege of Masada (7. 277); the speeches of Eleazar (7. 321); and the geographical determination of the Temple district of Leontopolis (7. 422).

Volume 2.1 contains a supplementary bibliography (including many irrelevant items and omitting many significant ones) which lists a number of works in Hebrew which were influential in establishing the Greek text. The third volume, in addition to several pages of supplementary bibliography and remarks about research on Josephus during the last few years, contains about 150 pages of four valuable indices, particularly to the notes, on persons and things, Greek ideas, places, and citations.

ENDRÖS' (139) version of the 'War' contains a brief general introduction but no notes.

SCHALIT (140), whose commentary in Hebrew on the first ten books of the 'Antiquities' is a fine contribution, had been working for many years prior to his recent death on an exhaustive commentary in German on Books 11–20 (the portions which the present author has seen are of very high quality), to be followed by a much expanded version in German of his Hebrew commentary on the first half of the work.

MURMELSTEIN (141) has compiled, in popular format, a volume of unannotated selections from Josephus' works, taken from six different translations.

GALLING—EDEL—BORGER (142) is a source-book containing the Greek text and notes on Antiquities 11. 302–303, 306, 309–311, 340, 342–344; 12. 138–139, 143–144, 140–142, and 258–264.

The German version of BARRETT (143) is by COLPE and is marked by very brief introductions and very few notes on War 2. 184–187, 192–203; Antiquities 18. 66–80, as well as other passages dealing with the Jewish history of this period.

LEIPOLDT and GRUNDMANN (144) is a beautiful edition of the sources, containing an anthology illustrating the history of the Jews taken largely from Josephus.

ENDRÖS (145) has a generous selection from his own translation.

#### 4.3: Translations (with or without Commentaries) into Hebrew

- (146) JACOB N. H. SIMCHONI (SIMCHOWITZ), trans.: Works of Josephus (in Hebrew), 4 vols. Warsaw–Berlin 1923–1930; rpt. Tel-Aviv, 1925–1938, 1955, 1959, 1961, 1970.
- (147) ALEXANDER SCHORR, trans.: Antiquitates Judaicae (in Hebrew), 2 vols. Jerusalem 1940–1945.

- (148) ABRAHAM SCHALIT, trans.: Josephus, *Antiquitates Judaicae* (in Hebrew). 3 vols. Jerusalem 1944–63.
- (149) SHMUEL HĀGGAI, trans.: Josephus, *Bellum Judaicum* (in Hebrew). Jerusalem 1964: 2nd ed., 1967.
- (150) JACOB N. H. SIMCHONI (SIMCHOWITZ), trans.: *The Army of Jerusalem* (in Hebrew). (“An Hour’s Reading from the Hebrew Literature,” 5). Tel-Aviv 1943.
- (151) EMANUEL BIN GORION (BERDICHEVSKY), trans.: *Herod and His House* (in Hebrew). Tel-Aviv 1946.
- (152) MENAHEM STERN, ed.: *The Documents on the Revolt of the Hasmoneans* (in Hebrew). Tel-Aviv 1965.
- (153) EPHRAIM TALMI, ed.: *The Book of Galilee* (in Hebrew). Tel-Aviv 1965.
- (154) HANS LEWY: *New Paths in the Investigation of Jewish Hellenism* (in Hebrew). In: *Zion* 10, 1945, pp. 197–204.
- (154a) URIEL RAPPAPORT: *Josephus Flavius: A Help Manual for Class* (in Hebrew). Haifa, Haifa University, 1971.
- (154b) DAVID AMIT, ed.: *Fortresses of the Desert in the Days of the Second Temple* (in Hebrew), 2nd ed., prepared for an assembly on Fortresses and Water Facilities in the Desert. Kefar Etzion 1976.

The translation into Hebrew by SIMCHONI (146), containing the ‘War’, ‘Against Apion’, and the ‘Life’ (the last by MENAHEM [EDMUND] STEIN), is full of inaccuracies and is stylistically far from Josephus.

SCHORR’s (147) ‘Antiquities’ remains incomplete; volume 1 contains Books 1–4, and volume 2 contains Books 5–8. It sometimes contains in its notes helpful rabbinic parallels. It is superseded by SCHALIT’s translation (148), of which the first two volumes contain the translation of and notes on Books 1–10, and the third the translation of Books 11–20. The commentary on these last books will eventually appear in German. SCHALIT is especially praiseworthy for his fidelity to the meaning of Josephus and for his excellent notes.

HĀGGAI’s (149) translation of the ‘War’ is into a Hebrew more modern than that of SIMCHONI, particularly in its military terminology. It has a very brief introduction and very skimpy notes.

A thirty-two-page pamphlet containing a portion of SIMCHONI’s (150) translation dealing with the Jewish army has been issued separately.

BIN GORION (151) contains selections in Hebrew from Book 1 of the ‘War’ and Book 14 of the ‘Antiquities’, popularly presented with few notes.

STERN (152) provides a Hebrew translation and brief but helpful notes for the following selections: *Antiquities* 12. 138–144, 145–146, 258–264; 13. 260–265; 14. 145–148, 233, and 247–255.

TALMI (153) has edited an anthology of brief, unannotated descriptions, stories, and poems dealing with Galilee. Included are many very short selections from Josephus.

LEWY (154), commenting on the first volume of SCHALIT’s (148) translation of the ‘Antiquities’ into Hebrew, avers that in accuracy and precision SCHALIT’s version is superior even to THACKERAY’s. In particular, he praises the portion of the introduction dealing with the relationship of Josephus with the Greek historiography of Thucydides and of Dionysius of Halicarnassus. He expresses the hope that the ‘War’ will find a Hebrew translator on a level with

SCHALIT (a hope not yet realized), since SIMCHONI'S (146) is full of errors and is done in a style unsuitable to the original.

RAPPAPORT (154a) has some selections from Josephus and from related literature in Hebrew translation for a course in Josephus.

AMIT (154b) contains selections, without commentary, from the sources, mostly Josephus, and maps concerning fortifications at Alexandrion, the Jericho area, Hyrcania, Herodium, Machaerus, and Masada. He uses SIMCHONI'S translation for the 'War' and SCHALIT'S for the 'Antiquities'.

#### 4.4: Translations (with or without Commentaries) into Italian

- (155) GIUSEPPE RICCIOTTI, trans.: Flavio Giuseppe tradotto e commentato. 4 vols. Turin 1937–1939, 1949, 1963.
- (156) ANGELO SCARPELLINI: Flavio Giuseppe tradotto e annotato. In: *Convivium* 10, 1938, pp. 692–697.
- (156a) GIOVANNI VITUCCI, trans.: La guerra giudaica / Flavio Giuseppe; con un'appendice sulla traduzione in russo antico a cura di NATALINO RADOVICH. 2 vols. Milan 1974.
- (156b) LUCIO TROIANI: Commento storico al 'Contro Apione' di Giuseppe. Introduzione, Commento Storico, Traduzione e Indici (Biblioteca degli studi classici e orientali, 9). Pisa 1977.

RICCIOTTI'S (155) fine translation of the 'Jewish War' into Italian devotes a full volume to a biography in black hues of Josephus and to a discussion of his works. The translation itself is accurate and lucid, and the notes are full. For an appreciation see SCARPELLINI (156).

VITUCCI (156a) has a critical edition of the Greek text, translation into Italian, and brief commentary of the 'War', together with a short introduction. There is an appendix by RADOVICH on the Slavonic version.

TROIANI (156b) has translated 'Against Apion' into Italian and has an extensive introduction concerning, in particular, the dates of traditions mentioned in the work, an historical commentary, and some textcritical notes.

#### 4.5: Translations (with or without Commentaries) into Spanish

- (157) JUAN A. G. LARRAYA, trans.: Las guerras de los judios. Barcelona 1952.
- (158) JOSÉ (GIUSEPPE) RICCIOTTI, trans.: Flavio Josefo traducido y comentado. La guerra giudaica. 3 vols. Barcelona 1960, 1969.
- (159) LUIS FARRÉ, trans.: Obras completas de Flavio Josefo. 5 vols. (Coleccion Valores en el tiempo, 26–30). Buenos Aires 1961.
- (160) FRANCISCO DE P. SAMARANCH, trans.: Josephus, Contra Apión. Madrid 1966.
- (161) MARIA ROSA LIDA DE MALKIEL: Dos Opúsculos Inéditos. In: *Davar* (Buenos Aires) no. 99, Oct.–Dec. 1963, pp. 70–77.

LARRAYA (157) has translated the 'War' into Spanish.

RICCIOTTI's translation of the 'War' into Italian (155) has been rendered into Spanish (158): this includes RICCIOTTI's long introduction on the life and works of Josephus, especially on the "Testimonium Flavianum".

FARRÉ (159) has translated the complete works of Josephus, including IV Maccabees; his notes are very few and brief.

SAMARANCH (160) has rendered 'Against Apion'.

LIDA DE MALKIEL (161) contains a translation into Spanish of Josephus' account of Alexander the Great in Jerusalem (Ant. 11. 317–339), together with a very brief, fragmentary introduction to Josephus generally rather than a commentary on this particular passage.

#### 4.6: Translations (with or without Commentaries) into Other Languages: Arabic, Czech, Dutch, Modern Greek, Hungarian, Japanese, Polish, Portuguese, Russian, Serbian

- (162) YOCEF B. D. RENASSIA, trans.: *Sefer Istvar Delihud*. Djerba, Tunisia, 1956.
- (163) JAROSLAV HAVELKA and JAROSLAV ŠONKA, trans.: *Josephus Flavius: Válka židovská z řečtiny přeložil* (introduction by STANISLAV SEGERT). Praha 1965.
- (164) MARTINUS A. BEEK, trans.: *De val van Jeruzalem* (Meulenhoff Pockets). Amsterdam 1958.
- (165) MARTINUS A. BEEK, trans.: *Flavius Josefus: Het Leven van Herodes* (Meulenhoff Pockets, 32). Amsterdam 1959.
- (166) VASILIOS M. VELLAS, trans.: *Φλαβίου Ἰωσήπου κατ' Ἀπίωνος, Λόγος Α' καὶ Λόγος Β'*. Athens 1938–1939.
- (167) JÓZSEF RÉVAY, trans.: *Josephus Flavius. A zsidók története* (= The Jewish History). Budapest 1946.
- (168) JÓZSEF RÉVAY, trans.: *Flavius Josephus. A zsidók története* (= The Jewish History). Books 11–12 (notes and preface by ISTVAN HAHN). Bratislava 1966.
- (169) JÓZSEF RÉVAY, trans.: *Josephus Flavius. A zsidó háború. Függetlenül: Flavius Josephus önéletrajza* (= The Jewish War; supplemented by Flavius Josephus' Biography). Budapest 1963.
- (170) IWAMOTO SHŪICHI, trans.: *F. Josephus ni yoru Yudayajin no rekishi* (= Jerusalem and Rome). Tokyo 1971.
- (170a) MASASHI TAKAHASHI: *Book of Ezra and Book of Nehemiah* (in Japanese). Tokyo 1951.
- (170b) HIROSHI SHINMI, trans.: *The Jewish War* (in Japanese). Vols. 1 and 2. Tokyo 1975, 1981.
- (170c) TOSHIO HIRANUMA, KINJI HIDEMURA, et al., edd.: *Sources for Intertestamental and New Testament Periods* (in Japanese). Tokyo 1976.
- (170d) GOHEI HATA, trans.: *Flavius Josephus: Contra Apionem* (in Japanese). Tokyo 1977.
- (170e) GOHEI HATA, trans.: *Flavius Josephus: Vita* (in Japanese). Tokyo 1978.
- (170f) GOHEI HATA, trans.: *Flavius Josephus: Antiquitates Judaicae, Books 12–13* (in Japanese). Tokyo 1979.
- (170g) GOHEI HATA, trans.: *Flavius Josephus: Antiquitates Judaicae, Books 14–15* (in Japanese). Tokyo 1980.
- (171) STANISLAW LENKOWSKI, trans.: *Josephus. Przeciw Apionowi* (= Against Apion). Lwów 1937.
- (172) ZYGMUNT KUBIAK and JAN RADOZYCKI, trans.: *Józef Flawiusz. Dawne dzieje Izraela. Antiquitates Judaicae* (introduction by EUGENIUSZ DABROWSKI; essay on Josephus in Polish by W. MALEJ). Poznan 1962.

- (173) VINCENTE PEDROSO, trans.: Flávio Josefo, *História dos Hebreus*. 9 vols. São Paulo, Brazil, 1956.
- (174) A. J. MALEINA, trans.: *Antiquitates Judaicae, Bellum Judaicum, Contra Apionem* (selections, in Russian). In: *Scythica et Caucasica* 1, 1947 (?), pp. 482–485 (cited by SCHRECKENBERG, *Bibliographie*, p. 243, who refers to *Vestnik Drevnej Istorij*, 1947, no. 4, pp. 275–277.
- (175) DUŠÁN GLUMAC, trans.: *Josephus Flavius: Judejski Rat (= Bellum Judaicum)*. Beograd 1967.

RENASSIA (162) contains portions of the 'War' translated from Hebrew into Arabic and written in Hebrew letters.

HAVELKA and SONKA (163) have an annotated translation of the 'War' into Czech with a twenty-five-page introduction by SEGERT.

In Dutch BEEK (164) has issued a selection from the 'War' on the fall of Jerusalem, as well as (165) excerpts from the 'Antiquities', Books 14–17, on the life of Herod.

VELLAS (166) contains a translation into modern Greek, with an introduction examining the source, date, and value, of 'Contra Apionem', together with a bibliography.

RÉVAY (167) has translated the 'Antiquities' into Hungarian but without notes. Books 11 and 12 of the translation (168) have been published separately with a preface and notes by HAHN. RÉVAY (169) has translated the 'War' and the 'Vita' with a very brief introduction and extremely few and brief notes.

Since the end of the Second World War the Japanese have evinced considerable interest in Judaism. One result of this has been SHŪICHI's (170) translation of GLATZER's 'Jerusalem and Rome' containing a history of Judaea from 134 B.C.E. to 73 (74) C.E. in Josephus' own words.

TAKAHASHI (170a), pp. 451–492, has a translation into Japanese of 'Antiquities', Book 11.

SHINMI (170b) has issued the first two of a projected three volumes containing the translation of the 'War'. With the death of SHINMI in 1979, the third volume is to be published by GOHEI HATA in 1982.

HIRANUMA, HIDEMURA, et al. (170c) have a sourcebook based on BARRETT (110), which includes numerous selections from Josephus' works.

HATA (170d) (170e) (170f) (170g) has issued a translation, with introduction and commentary, of 'Against Apion', the 'Life' and Books 12 through 15 of the 'Antiquities'; his future plans are to complete the translation of the 'Antiquities' into Japanese.

LĚNKOWSKI (171) has translated 'Against Apion' into Polish. KUBIAK and RADOZYCKI (172) have given us the first translation of the 'Antiquities' directly from Greek into Polish, basing themselves primarily on NIESE's Greek text, with an extensive and learned introduction on the life, works, and manuscript tradition of Josephus and on translations from Latin into Polish by DABROWSKI, with an essay on the transmission of the manuscripts, and on editions, translations, and scholarship pertaining to Josephus in Poland by MALEJ, a list (with brief discussion) by RADOZYCKI of post-Biblical authors cited in the 'Antiquities', and with an extensive bibliography (particularly of works in Polish)

by DABROWSKI. There are few notes except on the 'Testimonium Flavianum' and the Slavonic Josephus, and on Josephus' reference to James the brother of Jesus; these remarks are supplied with lengthy bibliographies.

PEDROSO (173) has translated the 'Antiquities' into Portuguese.

MALEINA (174) has the Greek text and translation into Russian of selections from the 'Antiquities', 'War', and 'Against Apion'.

GLUMAC (175) has translated the Latin version of the 'War' into Serbian.

## 5: The Latin and Syriac Versions

### 5.0: The Latin Versions: Introduction

There are two translations of Josephus into Latin: the first is a free reworking of the fourth century attributed to a certain Hegesippus (Egesippus), who claims to be writing an original work in accordance with the spirit of Christianity; the other is the famous translation made under the direction of Cassiodorus in the sixth century.

### 5.1: The Name Hegesippus

(176) VINCENTIUS USSANI, ed.: *Hegesippi qui dicitur historiae libri V* (Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum, vol. 66). Vol. 1 (Wien, Leipzig 1932); vol. 2 (with preface by Carolus Mras; Wien 1960).

Considerable confusion has arisen because the name Hegesippus was not used prior to the ninth century, so that when the work is referred to, for example, by Eucharius in the fifth century, Ambrosianus in the seventh century, and Cassellan in the ninth century, the author is called Josephus. Most scholars regard the name Hegesippus as a corruption of Josephus, but it was NIESE's theory that the name arose from an otherwise unknown Christian, Josippus.

USSANI (176) proposes that the name came about because of a confusion with the original Hegesippus, an ecclesiastical historian known to us by citations from his five books of 'Hypomnemata' in Eusebius' 'Historia Ecclesiastica'. Hence some scholars refer to our text as pseudo-Hegesippus. But, we may ask, if USSANI is right, why was the name Hegesippus not attached to our work until seven centuries after the original Hegesippus? The name would seem to be due to the same type of confusion with that of Josephus as occasioned the Hebrew Josippon (Josephon).

### 5.2: The Text of Hegesippus

(177) VINCENTIUS USSANI, ed.: *Hegesippi qui dicitur historiae libri V* (Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum, vol. 66), Vol. 1 (Wien, Leipzig 1932); vol. 2 (with preface by CAROLUS MRAS; Wien 1960).

(178) VINZENZ BULHART: *Textkritisches und Exegetisches zum Hegesippus*. In: *Mnemosyne* 6, 1953, pp. 314–317.

Because the text of Hegesippus circulated in so many widely differing recensions, it presents the student with a problem not unlike that confronting the student of the Septuagint, who wonders whether there ever was an Ur-Septuagint and, if so, whether it can be reconstructed. To a lesser degree the same kind of problem confronts the student of Josippon (Josephon).

USSANI (177) has, in Part 1, a critical edition of the text and, in Part 2, a preface by MRAS on the manuscripts, the title, and the author, as well as indices by USSANI. The edition has been subjected to criticism by BULHART (178).

### 5.3: Authorship of Hegesippus

- (179) JOSEPH WITTIG: Der Ambrosiaster Hilarius: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Papstes Damasus I. In: Breslauer Studien zur historischen Theologie (= Kirchengeschichtliche Abhandlungen) 4, 1906, pp. 1–66.
- (180) OTTO SCHOLZ: Die Hegesippus-Ambrosius-Frage. Eine literarhistorische Besprechung. In: Ambrosiaster-Studien (= Kirchengeschichtliche Abhandlungen) 8, 1909, pp. 149–195. (Diss., Univ. of Breslau [Königshütte] 1913).
- (181) ADOLF LUMPE: Zum Hegesipp-Problem. In: Byzantinische Forschungen 3, 1968, pp. 165–167 (= Lemmata: Festschrift Widu Wolfgang Ehlers. München 1968. Pp. 171–173).
- (182) VINCENTIUS USSANI, ed.: Hegesippi qui dicitur historiae libri V (Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum, vol. 66). Vol. 1 (Wien, Leipzig 1932); vol. 2 (with preface by CAROLUS MRAS; Wien 1960).
- (183) J. GRUBER, rev.: VINCENTIUS USSANI, ed., Hegesippi qui dicitur historiae libri V. In: Gnomon 34, 1962, pp. 685–686.
- (184) KARL MRAS: Drei seltene Stellen bei Iosippus (fälschlich Hegesippus), De bello Iudaico. In: Wiener Studien 74, 1961, pp. 138–141.
- (184a) ALBERT A. BELL, JR.: An Historiographical Analysis of the *De Excidio Hierosolymitano* of Pseudo-Hegesippus. Diss., Ph. D., University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill 1977.

One of scholarship's favorite indoor sports, especially at the turn of the century, had been to guess the identity of the author of Hegesippus. Some had argued that the author was the Ambrosiaster (pseudo-Ambrose, the unknown author of the commentary on the epistles of St. Paul) in Milan and had suggested a date in the second half of the fourth century.

WITTIG (179) had attempted to identify the author with Isaac of Judaea, portions of whose works on faith are still extant; and SCHOLZ (180) had similarly disputed the ascription to Ambrose.

LUMPE (181) revives the theory, on the basis of linguistic and stylistic similarities, that the author was Ambrose.

The way to resolve such a dispute, it would seem, is through close study and analysis of vocabulary, grammar, and style of the work as compared with other work of the same general period of similar content. MRAS, in the preface to USSANI (182), concludes that the style forces us to discard both Ambrose and the Ambrosiaster as the author; as for Isaac, the evidence is not decisive, since, as we may note, the works are not similar in subject matter.

GRUBER (183) has demonstrated the weakness of MRAS' (182) arguments. MRAS (184) has noted that the grammar of three passages in Hegesippus (2. 22,

2. 36. 2, 1. 41. 9) is definitely not consonant with that employed by Ambrose, and that they are, in fact, unparalleled in their Latinity. But until we have concordances of both Hegesippus and of other writers of the time, the matter must remain *sub iudice*.

BELL (184a) concludes that Hegesippus was probably a native of Antioch and was not Ambrose.

#### 5.4: The Content of Hegesippus and Its Relation to Josippon

- (185) ESTHER SORSCHER: A Comparison of Three Texts: The Wars, the Hegesippus, and the Yosippon. Diss., M.A., Yeshiva University, New York. January 1973.
- (186) YITZHAK BAER: The Book of Josephon the Hebrew (in Hebrew). In: Sefer Dinaburg. Jerusalem 1949. Pp. 178–205.
- (186a) ALBERT A. BELL, JR.: An Historiographical Analysis of the *De Excidio Hierosolymitano* of Pseudo-Hegesippus. Diss., Ph.D., University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill 1977.

In the great concern with establishing the authorship of Hegesippus, scholars have done little in investigation of the content itself of the work. The only systematic study is by SORSCHER (185), a fine first attempt, but clearly far from exhaustive even for the single Book 3 to which she restricts herself. Josippon's dependence on Hegesippus is clear from the fact, noted by SORSCHER, that he never includes anything omitted by Hegesippus, whereas he omits much that Hegesippus had taken from Josephus. Hegesippus' text portrays the Roman army as *sanctissimi commilitiones*, a veritable precursor of the church militant. SORSCHER's conclusion is that whereas Josephus' purpose is political, namely, to glorify Rome and to discourage rebellion, Hegesippus' is religious, to prove that the war was a divine punishment inflicted upon the Jews, while Josippon's is also religious but attempts to counter Hegesippus' negative attitude toward the Jews; he would have included, suggests SORSCHER, all references in the 'War' that praise the Jews had he seen it, but the fact that he did not include such passages proves that he had not seen it. Since Josephus himself played a more important role in the events recounted in Book 3 than in any other book of the 'War', his account is probably more biased than it is elsewhere, and hence it would have been preferable if SORSCHER had selected another book for the sample study. Moreover, there are many passages in Josephus himself that argue that the war is proof of divine punishment inflicted upon the Jews, a motif that SORSCHER ascribes to Hegesippus.

A close study of parallel texts in Hegesippus and Josippon would also help to establish the dates of these works. Thus BAER (186) shows that Agrippa's speech on rebellion in Hegesippus contains a fourth-century picture of the geography of the world, whereas in Josippon we have a reflection of tenth-century realities.

BELL (186a) contends that Pseudo-Hegesippus writes in the classical historiographical mould and was indeed the first Christian to attempt to do so. He compares his dependence on Josephus with Livy's on Polybius; but, we many comment,

Hegesippus' debt to Josephus is far greater, though, admittedly, he rewrites all of the speeches in Josephus and sometimes has versions eight or nine times as long as those in Josephus. Hegesippus, he notes, includes Christian material and, indeed, consulted sources other than Josephus, such as I Maccabees, Lucan, Suetonius, Tacitus, and probably Livy. Hence Hegesippus should be rehabilitated as a historian in his own right, who did not succumb to mere Christian apologetics.

### 5.5: The Text of the Latin Version Made under Cassiodorus' Direction

- (187) GIULANO USSANI: *Studi preparatori ad una edizione della traduzione latina in sette libri del 'Bellum Judaicum'*. Roma 1944. (= Bolletino del Comitato per la Preparazione dell' Edizione nazionale dei Classici greci e latini N.S. 1, 1945, pp. 86–102).
- (188) FRANZ BLATT: *Recherches sur l'établissement du texte et l'histoire de la tradition du Josèphe latin*: In: *Revue des Études Latines* 26, 1948, pp. 31–32.
- (189) FRANZ BLATT, ed.: *The Latin Josephus, I: Introduction and Text, The Antiquities, Books I–V* (*Acta Jutlandica* 30. 1, Hum. Ser. 44). Aarhus and Copenhagen 1958.
- (190) JAMES A. WILLIS, rev.: FRANZ BLATT, *The Latin Josephus, I*. In: *Journal of Roman Studies* 51, 1961, pp. 272–273.
- (191) DAVID FLUSSER, rev.: FRANZ BLATT, *The Latin Josephus, I*. In: *Kirjath Sefer* 34, 1958–59, pp. 458–463.
- (192) SVEN LUNDSTRÖM, rev.: FRANZ BLATT, *The Latin Josephus, I*. In: *Gnomon* 31, 1959, pp. 619–624.
- (192a) HEINZ SCHRECKENBERG: *Rezeptionsgeschichtliche und Textkritische Untersuchungen zu Flavius Josephus*. Leiden 1977.
- (193) FRANZ BLATT, ed.: *The Latin Josephus, II: The Antiquities, Books VI–X*. Awaiting publication.
- (194) VINZENZ BULHART: *Textkritische Studien zum lateinischen Flavius Josephus*. In: *Mnemosyne* 6, 1953, pp. 140–157.

One of the most important advances of the period under review has been in the study of the Latin version made under Cassiodorus' direction (whenever "the Latin version" is referred to, it is this that is meant).

USSANI (187) paved the way for a scientific edition of the Latin version of the 'War' which was never issued.

BLATT's (188) brief report on the manuscripts is preliminary to his edition of 'Antiquities', Books 1–5 (189). The Latin version had not been edited, except for BOYSEN's edition in 1898 of the work 'Against Apion', since 1524, when FROBENIUS, who did not have the Greek original at hand, did so; and BLATT spent thirty years on this, the first critical edition. A great part of the introduction is taken up by a description of the 171 (including 24 previously unknown) manuscripts of the work. There is a preliminary index which, while including many words missing from the 'Thesaurus', is very inadequate. Moreover, indices of medieval scribes of the manuscripts and of the owners of the manuscripts are desiderata. Unfortunately, as WILLIS (190) points out, BLATT's text is actually based not on all the manuscripts but on only a few. For this we should not fault him if his stemma were more careful. (Cf. the critique on this subject by FLUSSER [191]). What is most disconcerting is that without

warning manuscripts drop out as witnesses, only to return some time later, similarly without notice. If BLATT's transcriptions of one of the manuscripts in Plate 3 of his edition are any indication of his accuracy, he is far from trustworthy. LUNDSTRÖM (192), while generally praising BLATT's work, notes that he has, on the one hand, overlooked many major errors of the translation and, on the other hand, criticized the translator in many places, although the latter had interpreted the Greek text correctly.

SCHRECKENBERG (192a), p. 27, n. 8, has noted manuscripts overlooked by BLATT, in his edition.

BLATT's (193) typewritten manuscript of Books 6–10, based on the main codex (Ambrosianus papyraceus, of the ninth century), according to a private letter from BLATT, awaits publication; but a truly critical text remains a desideratum. Inasmuch as collation of 171 manuscripts is clearly a task that would take many years, what we need is construction of a stemma based on samplings at certain key points and then collation of the ten or fifteen most important manuscripts.

Inasmuch as the number of manuscripts is so large, the use of computers for arriving at a stemma and for selecting preferable readings may be possible and should be explored, though this would involve the massive preliminary task of getting all the readings into machine-readable form. By the time that one would have recorded all the variants it would seem as though the task would be virtually done.

Again, a concordance of the Latin version, as well as of other translations of this age, should prove useful in selecting readings and in determining the date and perhaps even the author of the translation. In particular, we may note that many errors in the manuscripts are due to the influence of the Vulgate on copyists.

One attempt at improving the Latin text, by BULHART (194), uses the *editio princeps* of FROBENIUS as its base, rather than collations of the manuscripts; and his emendations are generally convincing both palaeographically and in meaning.

#### 5.6: Individual Manuscripts and Early Printed Editions of the Latin Version

- (195) KARL H. USENER: The Provenance of the Rylands Manuscript of Flavius Josephus. In: *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 34, 1951–52, pp. 247–249.
- (196) FRANZ BLATT: Un nouveau manuscrit du Josèphe latin. In: *Estudis Luis Nicolau d'Olwer*, vol. 1. Barcelona 1961 (1966), pp. 17–20 (= *Estudis Romànics* 8).
- (197) ANDRÉE DE BOSQUE: A proposito di un manoscritto della Biblioteca universitaria di Valenza: il 'De bello judaico' di Giuseppe Flavio. In: *Commentari* 16, 1965, pp. 245–257.
- (198) WALTER CAHN: An Illustrated Josephus from the Meuse Region in Merton College, Oxford. In: *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 29, 1966, pp. 295–310.
- (199) WILHELM STÜWER: Zur Geschichte einer rheinischen Handschrift (Flavius Josephus, Berlin, Cod. lat. fol. 296). In: *Aus Kölnischer und rheinischer Geschichte. Festgabe Arnold Güttsches zum 65. Geburtstag gewidmet. Herausgegeben von HANS BLUM* (= *Veröffentlichungen des Kölnischen Geschichtsvereins*, vol. 29). Köln 1969. Pp. 163–178.

- (200) ARON FREIMANN: Incunables about Jews and Judaism. In: ISIDORE EPSTEIN, EPHRAIM LEVINE and CECIL ROTH, ed., *Essays in honour of Joseph H. Hertz*. London 1944. Pp. 159–186.

A number of individual manuscripts of the Latin version have received special study. USENER (195) has fixed, by a study of the decorated initials, the place of origin of a twelfth-century manuscript of the Latin Josephus as the Abbey of Notre-Dame-Bonne-Espérance at Vellereille-les-Brayeux in Hainaut.

BLATT (196) has studied a relatively less important and more faulty manuscript of the Lenin Library in Moscow of the twelfth or the beginning of the thirteenth century containing the Latin version of 'Antiquities', Books 1–12, and notes a number of neologisms in it.

DE BOSQUE (197) discusses a fifteenth-century manuscript of the 'War' and, in particular, its miniatures, the style of which is characteristic of the Paduan School and which up to now has been attributed to GASPARA ROMANO (fl. 1500).

CAHN (198) has described the most extensively illustrated manuscript of Josephus extant prior to the thirteenth century, a twelfth-century manuscript of the Latin version. He tries by comparative analysis to identify some of the iconographic precedents which stand behind the historiated initials and connects the style of the art work with a group of Biblical manuscripts from Liège. The present writer would like to suggest that the illustrated Passover Haggadahs may go back to such illustrations.

STÜWER (199) traces the fascinating history of a twelfth-century manuscript, particularly in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, citing its use by several humanists, notably CINCINNUS (JOHANNES KRUYSHAER), and its relation to early printed editions of Josephus, and remarking that the printing from this manuscript was even the occasion of a lawsuit in 1535–1539.

FREIMANN (200) has described a printed edition of the Latin Josephus by JOHANN MENTELIN in STRASSBURG in 1471–1473 (?) and an edition of the version in Paris in 1476 (?).

### 5.7: Authorship of the Latin Josephus

- (201) EMIL SCHÜRER: *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C. to A.D. 135)*, revised and edited by GEZA VERMES and FERGUS MILLAR. Vol. 1. Edinburgh 1973. Pp. 43–64: Josephus (revised by TESSA RAJAK).
- (202) GIULIANO USSANI: *Studi preparatori ad una edizione della traduzione latina in sette libri del 'Bellum Judaicum'*. Roma 1944. (= *Bolletino del Comitato per la Preparazione dell'Edizione nazionale dei Classici greci e latini* N. S. 1, 1945, pp. 86–102).

Cassiodorus sent his monks to read the 'War' in a translation in seven books, adding that the translation was ascribed, according to the manuscripts, to Jerome, Ambrose, or Rufinus. In our manuscripts the translation is usually ascribed to Rufinus, sometimes to Jerome. The fact that Cassiodorus describes the translation as having extraordinary diction leads RAJAK, the reviser of the chapter on Josephus in the new SCHÜRER (201), to ascribe it to Hegesippus, who

wrote in a fine Sallustian style. But this, we may reply, is unlikely, since Hegesippus, at least as we have him, is in five books, whereas Cassiodorus says the 'War' is in the Latin, as in the Greek, in seven books. Only Hegesippus – and not the Latin Josephus – is ascribed to Ambrose, and so we sense that Cassiodorus has confused Hegesippus with the Latin version.

USSANI (202) remains uncertain as to the identity of the translator of the 'War' but argues that it cannot be Rufinus, since no translation of Josephus is mentioned in Gennadius' catalogue of Rufinus' translations.

### 5.8: Importance of the Latin Version

- (203) GEORGE C. RICHARDS and ROBERT J. H. SHUTT: Critical Notes on Josephus' 'Antiquities'. In: *Classical Quarterly* 31, 1937, pp. 170–177; 33, 1939, pp. 180–183.
- (204) HEINZ SCHRECKENBERG: Einige Vermutungen zum Josephustext. In: *Theokratia: Jahrbuch des Institutum Judaicum Delitzschianum* 1, 1967–1969 (Leiden 1970), pp. 64–75.
- (205) DAVID FLUSSER, rev.: FRANZ BLATT, ed., *The Latin Josephus, I: Introduction and Text, The Antiquities (in Hebrew)*. In: *Kirjath Sefer* 34, 1958–1959, pp. 458–463.
- (206) LOUIS H. FELDMAN: Prolegomenon. In: MONTAGUE R. JAMES, *The Biblical Antiquities of Philo*. New York 1971. Pp. ix–clxix.
- (206a) FRANCIS J. WITTY: Book Terms in the Vivarium Translations. In: *Classical Folia* 28, 1974, pp. 62–82.
- (206b) SVEN LUNDSTRÖM: *Übersetzungstechnische Untersuchungen auf dem Gebiete der christlichen Latinität*. Lund 1955.

The chief value of the Latin version is to aid in reconstructing the Greek text, since the Latin translation is about half a millennium earlier than our oldest Greek manuscript. RICHARDS and SHUTT (203) have noted the usefulness of the version, particularly in reconstructing proper names (even when it itself is corrupt) and in filling in lacunae. SCHRECKENBERG's (204) emendations, however, inspired by the Latin translation, show the limitations of this approach.

In addition, the Latin version, as FLUSSER (205) has noted, is an important source for the Latin literary language of the period when it was made, and likewise is significant for the theory of translation of this era (a study of it would probably shed light on the method of translation of the Vulgate and of Pseudo-Philo's 'Biblical Antiquities' into Latin, as I [206], pp. xxvi–xxvii, have suggested).

WITTY (206a) has done an interesting study of the art of translation employed by Cassiodorus and his 'team' in rendering the Greek terms for writing materials, scribes, script, archives, etc., in the 'Historia Tripartita' and Josephus' 'Antiquities' and 'Against Apion'. He concludes that the translators generally did not go about their work in a systematic manner, except when the meanings of the technical terms had become firmly established in customary usage, and that they were apparently not concerned by their general lack of consistency in rendering these technical terms.

LUNDSTRÖM (206b) shows the value of the Latin version of Josephus' 'Against Apion' by often reconstructing the Greek that it is translating. He presents valuable comments on its vocabulary and syntax and especially on the

errors made by the translator, classifying the types, such as the confusion of sounds.

The Latin version also had considerable influence on medieval literature, and especially on the religious disputes between Jews and non-Jews. The Latin version, consequently, because of its widespread use, is often helpful in reconstructing the text of medieval writers, such as Peter Comestor, who quarried from it. We may add that the Latin Josephus was extremely popular during the period of the Crusades, since it was regarded as a valuable source of information on the Holy Land and its history. FLUSSER (205), however, is wrong in noting its importance for Josippon, which, he says, is based for the most part on the Latin Josephus; actually it is based on Hegesippus.

### 5.9: The Syriac Version

(206c) ALLISON P. HAYMAN, ed. and trans.: *The Disputation of Sergius the Stylite against a Jew* (*Corpus Christianorum Orientalium*, 338 (text); 339 (trans.). Louvain 1973.

(206d) HEIMANN KOTTEK: *Das sechste Buch des Bellum Judaicum nach der von Ceriani photolithographisch edirten Peschitta-Handschrift übersetzt und kritisch bearbeitet*. Diss. Leipzig. Berlin 1886.

(206e) THEODOR NÖLDEKE, rev.: HEIMANN KOTTEK, *Das sechste Buch des Bellum Judaicum nach der von Ceriani photolithographisch edirten Peschitta-Handschrift übersetzt und kritisch bearbeitet*. In: *Literarisches Centralblatt* (Leipzig) 1886, pp. 881–884.

HAYMAN (206c) argues that there existed a Syriac translation of the full ‘War’ and not merely of the sixth book, that this translation was made directly from the Greek and was very literal but of very poor quality. KOTTEK (206d), in his edition of the Syriac version of Book 6, had declared that our Greek text is a modified version of the Syriac; HAYMAN follows NÖLDEKE (206e) is contesting this. He suggests that a collation of the Syriac with the Slavonic version would throw additional light on the textual affinities of both versions.

## 6: The Slavonic Version

### 6.0: The Text of the Slavonic Version and Translations Thereof

- (207) RALPH MARCUS: Josephus, Flavius. In: L. A. LOETSCHER, ed., *Twentieth Century Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge: An Extension of the New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*. Grand Rapids 1955. Vol. 1, p. 614.
- (208) ROBERT EISLER: *The Messiah Jesus* (trans. into English by ALEXANDER H. KRAPPE of his ИХСОУС БАЦІАЕУС ОУ БАЦІАЕУСАС). London 1931. Appendix 25: *Select Bibliography on the Slavonic Josephus Problem*, pp. 624–630.
- (209) VIKTOR M. ISTRIN, ed.: *La prise de Jérusalem de Josèphe le Juif*. Printed under the direction of ANDRÉ VAILLANT, translated into French by PIERRE PASCAL. 2 vols. Paris 1934–1938; rpt. Monaco 1964.
- (210) N. A. MEŠČERSKIJ: *Istorija iudeskoij vojny Josifa Flavija etc.* (= *History of the War of the Jews of Flavius Josephus in Old Russian*). Moscow and Leningrad 1958.
- (211) S. SZYSZMAN, rev.: N. A. MEŠČERSKIJ, *Istorija iudeskoij vojny Josifa Flavija*. In: *Revue de Qumran* 1, 1959, pp. 451–458.
- (212) ANDRÉ VAILLANT, rev.: N. A. MEŠČERSKIJ, *Istorija iudeskoij vojny Josifa Flavija*. In: *Semítica* 9, 1959, pp. 89–93.
- (213) GIUSEPPE FERMEGLIA: *Contributi alla critica testuale paleoslava*. In: *Rendiconti dell'Istituto Lombardo, Classe di Lettere, Scienze morali e storiche* 102, 1968, pp. 213–255.

MARCUS (207), writing in 1955, says that there have been four significant additions to our knowledge of Josephus since 1910, and one of them is the study of the Slavonic translation of the 'War'. A more thorough knowledge of the Slavonic text may even on occasion help us to reconstruct the original Greek, though it is based on an apparently inferior Greek text.

In view of the tremendous amount of discussion of the Slavonic version (called 'The Capture of Jerusalem') of the 'Jewish War', especially during the 1920's and early 1930's (see EISLER [208] for an extensive bibliography), it is surprising that there was no complete critical edition of the version until ISTRIN (209) published his with a French translation by PASCAL on opposite pages, with notes, and with a brief lexicon at the end of volume 2 by VAILLANT. The French translation has now been reissued as a paperback with slight corrections, with notes reduced to a minimum, and with a new preface. Another critical edition, that of MEŠČERSKIJ (210), to judge from the reviews by SZYSZMAN (211) and VAILLANT (212), represents important advances. FERMEGLIA (213) suggests a number of emendations in Slavonic texts, notably the 'War', which improve the text or justify divergences from the Greek.

### 6.1: The Language of the Slavonic Version

- (214) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: *The Slavonic Josephus and the Dead Sea Scrolls: An Exposé of Recent Fairy Tales*. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 58, 1967–68, pp. 173–203.
- (215) N. A. MEŠČERSKIJ: *Istorija iudeskoj vojny Josifa Flavija etc.* (= *History of the War of the Jews of Flavius Josephus in Old Russian*). Moscow and Leningrad 1958.
- (216) EVA KRULL: *Zur Bildsprache des altrussischen Josephus Flavius*. Diss., Bonn 1959.
- (217) MOISEI M. KOPYLENKO: *O jazyke drevne-russkogo perevoda 'Istorii Iudesjskoj vojny' Iusifa Flavija (Glagol'no-immenye frazeologizmy)* (in Russian = *On the Language of the Old Russian Translation of Josephus Flavius' History of the Judaeen War [the infinitive phrases]*). In: *Vizantijskij Vremennik* 20, 1961, pp. 164–183.

The language of the version, as ZEITLIN (214) points out, is not Slavonic but Old North Russian (see the philological evidence in MEŠČERSKIJ [215], pp. 90–96) and contains many Greek words which came into vogue in the Byzantine period.

A doctoral thesis by KRULL (216) is a study of the similes, metaphors, personifications, and other figures of speech in the version. KRULL's chief interest is in paving the way for a study of the relationship of the version to Old Russian literature generally. There is an extensive bibliography (pp. 216–221), particularly of Russian works bearing on the subject.

According to the latest editor, MEŠČERSKIJ (215), in an obvious display of national pride, the translator was a man of great talent with a creative bent; and the Vilna Manuscript of the Slavonic version is thus one of the most precious monuments of medieval Russian literature.

KOPYLENKO (217) makes a special study of the infinitive constructions.

### 6.2: The Date, Source, Authorship, and Purpose of the Slavonic Josephus

- (218) ALEXANDER BERENDTS: *Die Zeugnisse vom Christentum im slavischen 'De Bello Judaico' des Josephus*. Leipzig 1906.
- (219) ALEXANDER BERENDTS and KONRAD GRASS, trans.: *Flavius Josephus, Vom Jüdischen Kriege Buch I–IV, nach der slavischen Übersetzung deutsch herausgegeben und mit dem griechischen Text verglichen*. 2 vols. Dorpat 1924–1927.
- (220) VIKTOR M. ISTRIN, ed.: *La prise de Jérusalem de Josèphe le Juif*. Printed under the direction of ANDRÉ VAILLANT, translated into French by PIERRE PASCAL. 2 vols. Paris 1934–1938; rpt. Monaco 1964.
- (221) ROBERT EISLER: *ΙΗΣΟΥΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣΑΣ*, 2 vols. Heidelberg 1929–30. Abridged translation into English by ALEXANDER H. KRAPPE: *The Messiah Jesus and John the Baptist according to Flavius Josephus' Recently Discovered Capture of Jerusalem and Other Jewish and Christian Sources*. London 1931.
- (222) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: *Josephus on Jesus*. Philadelphia 1931.
- (223) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: *The Slavonic Josephus and the Dead Sea Scrolls: An Exposé of Recent Fairy Tales*. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 58, 1967–68, pp. 173–203.
- (224) HARALD FUCHS: *Der geistige Widerstand gegen Rom in der antiken Welt*. Berlin 1938. 2nd ed., Berlin 1964.
- (225) NIKOLAI K. GUDZII: *History of Early Russian Literature*. Trans. from the 2nd Russian ed. by SUSAN W. JONES. New York 1949.

- (226) JOHN STRUGNELL: Josephus, Flavius. In: *New Catholic Encyclopedia* 7, 1967, pp. 1120–1123.
- (227) N. A. MEŠČERSKIJ: *Istorija iudeskoj vojny Josifa Flavija etc.* (in Russian: = *History of the War of the Jews of Flavius Josephus in Old Russian*). Moscow and Leningrad 1958.
- (228) S. SZYSZMAN, rev.: N. A. MEŠČERSKIJ, *Istorija iudeskoj vojny Josifa Flavija*. In: *Revue de Qumran* 1, 1959, pp. 451–458.
- (229) N. A. MEŠČERSKIJ: *Znachenie drevneslavjanskikh perevodov dlja vosstanovleniia ikh arkhjetipov* (in Russian: = *The Importance of Old Slavic Translations for the Reconstruction of Their Archetypes*). In: ANDREI N. ROBINSON, ed., *Issledovaniia po slavjanskomu literaturovediiu i folkloristike*. Sovetskii komitet slavistov, Akademiia Nauk SSR. Moscow 1960. Pp. 61–94.
- (230) ALFONS HÖCHERL: *Zur Übersetzungstechnik des altrussischen „Jüdischen Krieges“ des Josephus Flavius*. Diss., München 1969. Rpt. München 1970 (= *Slavistische Beiträge*, Bd. 46).

BERENDTS (218), in an article written before his translation with GRASS (219) of the Slavonic version into German and before the translation of PASCAL (220) into French, had hypothesized that the Slavonic version had been translated directly from the Aramaic version in which Josephus had originally written the 'Jewish War'.

EISLER (221) at first accepted this view. When evidence was cited that it was translated from a Greek text, EISLER suggested that Josephus had at first made a rough draft of his work in Aramaic, which was translated into Greek by Josephus' assistants, and that the Slavonic version was later made on the basis of the Greek by a Judaizing sect in Russia in the fifteenth century.

ZEITLIN (222) vehemently and, on the whole, successfully refuted EISLER; to ZEITLIN, who made, in his zeal, a special trip to Russia to study the Slavonic version, it was a seventh-century Byzantine paraphrase of the Greek Josephus, with indications that the writer also knew Hegesippus. ZEITLIN (223) later changed his mind as to the date, ascribing it to the eleventh century.

FUCHS (224), on the basis of a comparison with other Byzantine writings of the period, concluded that it was done by a Byzantine writer of the twelfth or thirteenth century.

In a convincing work GUDZII (225), however, notes that the ideas, terminology, and phraseology are those of Russian works, notably chronicles, of the middle of the eleventh century, especially in battle scenes and similes, as well as in rhythmic patterns.

By a different route STRUGNELL (226) arrives at a similar conclusion of a date in the tenth or eleventh century, noting the close textual relationship of the Slavonic version to a Byzantine text which lacks the additional material.

The question of date and the language from which the translation was made seems to have been settled by MEŠČERSKIJ (227), for an evaluation of whom I rely upon the review by SZYSZMAN (228). By a careful linguistic analysis MEŠČERSKIJ concludes that the translation was made not from Aramaic but from Greek in the eleventh century.

In a later article MEŠČERSKIJ (229) stresses that the significant differences in style, together with the additions and omissions in the translation, must be considered the original work of the translator. Like EISLER, MEŠČERSKIJ connects the

translation with the Khazars, who had been converted to Judaism in the eighth century, but he finds much Christian phraseology in it and argues that it was used in the ideological struggle against the Khazars.

HÖCHERL (230), after a full-scale study of the Slavonic Josephus, concludes, from the use of such constructions as the articular infinitive, that the source was Greek, which only in unessential details diverges from the text printed by NIESE. He says that additions and omissions, with few exceptions, are to be attributed to the translator, who did his work not in South Slavic territory but in Kievan Russia.

### 6.3: Problems of Genuineness, Omissions, and Additions of the Slavonic Version

- (231) HENRY ST. JOHN THACKERAY: *Josephus the Man and the Historian*. New York 1929; rpt. 1967.
- (232) FRANCIS I. ANDERSEN: *The Diet of John the Baptist*. In: *Abr-Nahrain* 3, 1961–62, pp. 60–74.
- (233) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: *The Slavonic Josephus and the Dead Sea Scrolls: An Exposé of Recent Fairy Tales*. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 58, 1967–68, pp. 173–203.
- (234) SAMUEL G. F. BRANDON: *Jesus and the Zealots: A Study of the Political Factor in Primitive Christianity*. Manchester 1967. Trans. into French by GEORGES and BÉATRICE FORMENTELLI: *Jésus et les Zélotes*, Paris 1976.
- (235) RUPERT FURNEAUX: *The Roman Siege of Jerusalem*. New York 1972; London 1973.
- (236) ALEXANDER BERENDTS: *Die Zeugnisse vom Christentum im slavischen 'De Bello Judaico' des Josephus*. Leipzig 1906.
- (237) VIKTOR M. ISTRIN, ed.: *La prise de Jérusalem de Josèphe le Juif*. Printed under the direction of ANDRÉ VAILLANT, trans. into French by PIERRE PASCAL. 2 vols. Paris 1934–38; rpt. Monaco 1964.
- (238) NIKOLAI K. GUDZII: *History of Early Russian Literature*. Trans. from the 2nd Russian ed. by SUSAN W. JONES. New York 1949. Pp. 57–63.
- (239) ROBERT EISLER: *IHCOYC BACIAEYC OY BACIAEYCAC*. 2 vols. Heidelberg 1929–30.
- (240) SALOMON REINACH: *Orpheus; histoire générale des religions*. Paris 1909. Trans. from French by FLORENCE SIMMONDS: *Orpheus: A History of Religions*. London 1909. Pp. 246–249.
- (241) H. W. KARS: *Der älteste nichtchristliche Jesusbericht*. In: *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* 108, 1937, pp. 40–64.
- (242) WALTHER BIENERT: *Der älteste nichtchristliche Jesusbericht. Josephus über Jesus. Unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des altrussischen 'Josephus'*. Halle 1936.
- (243) AGOSTINO GOETHALS: *La versione slava di Giuseppe Flavio*. In: *Religio* 14, 1938, pp. 250–265.
- (244) HENDRIK VAN DER LOOS: *Jezus Messias-Koning. Een speciaal Onderzoek naar de Vraag of Jesus van Nazaret politieke Bedoelingen heeft nagestreeft* (Academisch Proefschrift). Assen 1942.
- (245) KARL L. SCHMIDT: *Der Todesprozess des Messias Jesus: Die Verantwortung der Juden, Heiden und Christen für die Kreuzigung Jesu Christi*. In: *Judaica* (Zürich) 1, 1945, pp. 1–40.
- (246) FELIX SCHEIDWEILER: *Sind die Interpolationen im altrussischen Josephus wertlos? In: Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 43, 1950–51, pp. 155–178.
- (247) SABBAS C. AGOURIDES: *To problēma tōn prosthēkōn tēs Slaounikēs metaphraseōs tou*

- Ioudaikou polemou tou Iōsēpou kai hē en autais peri tou Baptistou kai tou Iēsou Khristou marturia. Athens 1954.
- (248) PAUL-LOUIS COUCHOUD: Les textes relatifs à Jesus dans la version slave de Josèphe. In: *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* 93, 1926, pp. 44–64.
- (249) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: A Commentary on the Book of Habakkuk: Important Discovery or Hoax? In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 39, 1948–49, pp. 235–247.
- (250) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: *Josephus on Jesus*. Philadelphia 1931.
- (251) JAMES W. JACK: *The Historic Christ: An Examination of Dr. Robert Eisler's Theory, according to the Slavonic Version of Josephus and the Other Sources*. London 1933.
- (252) N. A. MEŠČERSKIJ: *Istorija iudeskoij vojny Josifa Flavija, etc.* (in Russian: = *History of the War of the Jews of Flavius Josephus in Old Russian*). Moscow and Leningrad 1958.
- (253) JOSEPH SPENCER KENNARD JR.: *Slavonic Josephus: A Retraction*. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 39, 1948–49, pp. 281–283.
- (254) ARIE RUBINSTEIN: *Observations on the Old Russian Version of Josephus' Wars*. In: *Journal of Semitic Studies* 2, 1957, pp. 329–348.
- (255) HAIM COHN: *The Trial and Death of Jesus* (in Hebrew). Tel-Aviv 1968. Trans. into English: New York 1971.
- (255a) HUGH SCHONFIELD: *According to the Hebrews: A New Translation of the Jewish Life of Jesus (The 'Toldoth Jeshu'), with an inquiry into the nature of its sources and special relationship to the lost Gospel according to the Hebrews*. London 1937.
- (255b) GÖSTA LINDESKOG: *Die Jesusfrage im neuzeitlichen Judentum. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung*. Leipzig 1938; rpt. Darmstadt 1973.
- (225c) LÉON HERRMANN: *Chrestos: Témoignages païens et juifs sur le christianisme du premier siècle*. Brussels 1970.
- (255d) VIRGIL R. L. FRY: *The Warning Inscriptions from the Herodian Temple*. Diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Kentucky 1974.
- (255e) JOHANN MAIER: *Jesus von Nazareth in der talmudischen Überlieferung*. Darmstadt 1978.

Despite the occasional specifically Josephan phraseology, the predominant Jewish coloring, and omissions that might indicate that the version was made from a shortened Aramaic original, unfortunately no one has made a systematic study of the omissions in the version. There has long been a suspicion as to the genuineness of the version because, as THACKERAY (231), p. 152, has noted, the manuscripts containing it are late, it is derived from a Greek text which NIESE regarded as inferior, there is no clear attestation in early writers, and it is apparently dependent on the New Testament, as, for example, in the story of Herod Philip and Herodias and in the reasons given by the Roman procurators for not taking action against the early Christians. In particular, there are a number of additions in the Slavonic version which are not found in the Greek Josephus, notably a statement of how he saved his life through manipulation of the lots at Jotapata, a description of two dreams by Herod, a specification of the oaths taken on admission to the order of Essenes, moralizings on Divine providence and on Herod's sins and punishment, the Zealots' disregard of the Biblical warnings, a secret debate by the priests at the time of Herod explaining the prophecy of Daniel regarding the Messiah, the ruse of Vitellius at the battle of Bedriacum, two attacks on the venality of the Latins, and, most particularly, passages on John the Baptist and Jesus. Still, THACKERAY originally accepted the version as authentic, only to recant shortly before his death.

The additions regarding John and Jesus, who are referred to respectively as "the wild man" and "the wonder-worker," have occasioned particular comment. The wild man is the leader of a political movement commencing twenty years earlier than in the New Testament. He eats "tree sprouts," not "wood shavings," as ANDERSEN (232) notes, and is so extreme in his asceticism that he even abstains from unleavened bread on Passover. A political aspect is likewise given to the wonder-worker, who is vainly urged by 150 of his close disciples to lead a revolt against the Romans. Pilate, whose wife had been healed by him, arrests but then releases him, only to be induced by a bribe of thirty talents from the Jews to deliver him to them for crucifixion. We are told that he was crucified by the Jews for announcing the destruction of the city and the desolation of the Temple.

Are these passages specifically interpolated and hence of no value for the study of Josephus, as ZEITLIN (233) argues, or are they translations from the text being rendered by the translator and hence of value in checking a number of problems left by the Gospels, notably whether, as BRANDON (234) and FURNEAUX (235) in particular have stressed, Jesus was a political revolutionary?

BERENDTS (236) and ISTRIN (237) had presented the hypothesis that Josephus revised his original Greek translation, omitting all passages which might displease the Jews. But as GUDZII (238) has pointed out, Josephus could hardly, as a Jew, have spoken with such sympathy of John and Jesus, and, we might add, with such antipathy of the role of the Jews. The additions, he notes, have the stylistic peculiarities of the rest of the work.

EISLER (239), who suggested that the translation was made by a Judaizing sect in the fifteenth century, could not, of course, state that such a sect would go even further than the New Testament in ascribing the crucifixion to the Jews; and so he admitted that there were some interpolations, a view which was followed by REINACH (240).

KARS (241) attacks EISLER (239) and defends BIENERT (242) in arguing, on internal grounds, that the Jesus and John passages in the Slavonic Josephus are due to an interpolation, not to Josephus. These interpolated passages, says KARS, were inserted during the eleventh century and reflect the conflict between the Roman and Byzantine Churches.

GOETHALS (243) suggests that the additions in the Slavonic version concerning John and Jesus had a Christian origin in the second century.

I have not seen VAN DER LOOS' (244) discussion, pp. 211-216, of the passage about Jesus in the Slavonic Josephus.

SCHMIDT (245) says that the picture in the Slavonic version of Jesus as a messianic activist rebel is supported by the Gospels, and that the Slavonic Josephus merely represents a coarsened version.

SCHEIDWEILER (246) carries the interpolations back ever further to a Jewish history of Josephus' day but opposed to Josephus in outlook; but this, we may remark, is a mere conjecture, there being no evidence for a history of that period with such a Christian bias against the Jews.

AGOURIDES (247) has an extensive, valuable commentary in modern Greek on the principal twenty-two additions in the Slavonic version and suggests, on

the basis of the theology of the additions, a date between 190 and 250 for the Christian interpolations, thus agreeing with COUCHOUD (248), p. 56; but such a criterion, we may retort, seems unreliable, both because the passages are too brief and insufficiently distinctive from a theological point of view and also because theologies are often revived at a later date.

No doubt ZEITLIN (249) is correct in stating that if the passages about Jesus were at such an early date in the original Greek text from which the Slavonic version was made, the Church Fathers would have cited them since they go further than even the New Testament in ascribing guilt to the Jews. The Jesus passages, says ZEITLIN (250), come from the 'Acta Pilati'; but, we may reply, the passages in the Slavonic version are too brief to admit of proof.

JACK (251), in another critique of EISLER's theory, suggests that the Jesus passages were interpolated by Orthodox Christians in answer to the Judaizing sect cited by EISLER. But, we may note, the definitive studies by MEŠČERSKIJ (252) indicate that the translation was completed long before the Judaizing sect made its appearance; and if, with MEŠČERSKIJ, we say that the event that produced the translation was the conversion of the Khazars, this is too early, since it occurred in the eighth century, and a reaction against them, to be effective, would probably have been undertaken long before the eleventh century. That the translation, or at least the passage about Jesus, is the work of a Christian seems clear from the words that "they [the Jews] crucified him according to the law of their fathers." If the author were a Jew, as KENNARD (253) is forced to admit, he would have written "our fathers."

The question of the source of the statement that John was a revolutionary who accepted only G-d as his ruler has been raised by ANDERSEN (232), who notes that though this interpolation has undoubted affinities with the view of the Fourth Philosophy (*Antiquities* 18. 23), the translator did not, as RUBINSTEIN (254) has demonstrated, use the 'Antiquities', and hence the resemblance is due to indirect transmission, probably through George Hamartolos, who was much indebted to Josephus and whose chronicles were much used by Russian chroniclers.

COHN (255) disagrees with the theory that the Slavonic Josephus was written by a Jewish apologist other than Josephus who wanted to satisfy his Jewish readers that Jesus had been deservedly crucified by the Jews. It is incredible, he says, that a Jewish apologist would take the crucifixion out of Pilate's hands and make the Jews responsible. We may, however, suggest that perhaps the author wanted to prove to the Romans that the Jews had tried to nip the movement in the bud.

SCHONFIELD (255a) rejects EISLER (239) and contends that the additions in the Slavonic Josephus are interpolations, noting several close verbal parallels between it and the medieval Hebrew life of Jesus known as 'Toledoth Yeshu'. He suggests that both ultimately go back to a lost Gospel of the Hebrews. He concludes that it is probable that the Greek text on which the Slavonic Josephus and the 'Toledoth Yeshu' rest dates from the eighth century. We may observe, however, that the parallels which SCHONFIELD cites between the Slavonic version and the 'Toledoth Yeshu' are hardly striking; and the differences in

incidental matters, such as the number of followers of Jesus (150 in the Slavonic Josephus, 310 in the "Toledoth Yeshu"), argue for independent sources.

LINDESKOG (255b), pp. 191–196, summarizes the scholarship on the Jesus passages in the "Testimonium Flavianum" and in the Slavonic Josephus, with particular attention to ZEITLIN's views.

HERRMANN (255c), pp. 104–115, commenting on the passages in the Slavonic version pertaining to Jesus, concludes that the author is a Christian, noting that Halosis (the Slavonic version) 1. 31. 6 (= War 1. 641–646) alludes to the city of Charan in Mesopotamia and to the return of Abraham by G-d far from his native place, precisely the point that is made in Hippolytus, *Philosophoumena* 10.30. But, we may contend, it seems hard to believe that a Christian, unless we are dealing with a heretical group and perhaps with a non-canonical Gospel, would have failed to mention Jesus' name at all, that he would not have stated that he was the Messiah, that he would equivocate by declaring that he was "something more than a man" but that he would "not call him an angel", that in many things he disobeyed the Law, that his followers expected him to rout the Roman troops, and that the Jewish rabbis gave thirty talents to Pilate in order to put him to death, in disagreement with the Gospel account.

FRY (255d), pp. 287–289, contains a brief appendix summarizing the debate concerning the Slavonic version. He agrees, on the whole, with ZEITLIN in preferring the Greek to the Slavonic version and hence regards the statement (War 5. 194) that the warning to foreigners to keep away from the Temple was in Greek, Latin, and Hebrew characters (whereas the Greek inscription states merely that it was in Greek and Latin) as due to an interpolation.

MAIER (255e), pp. 46–47, comments briefly on the Jesus passage in the Slavonic Josephus.

#### 6.4: The Slavonic Version, the Dead Sea Scrolls, and the Essenes

- (256) MARC PHILONENKO: La notice du Josèphe slave sur les Esséniens. In: *Semitica* 6, 1956, pp. 69–73.
- (257) ARIE RUBINSTEIN: The Essenes according to the Slavonic Version of Josephus' Wars. In: *Vetus Testamentum* 6, 1956, pp. 307–308.
- (258) ARIE RUBINSTEIN: Observations on the Old Russian Version of Josephus' Wars. In: *Journal of Semitic Studies* 2, 1957, pp. 329–348.
- (259) ANDRÉ VAILLANT: Le Josèphe slave et les Esséniens. In: *Semitica* 8, 1958, pp. 39–40.

The discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls has renewed interest in the Slavonic version, particularly in its account of the Essenes. PHILONENKO (256) asserts that the Scrolls, especially the Rule of the Community, confirm the account of the Essenes in the Slavonic Josephus, and that the Slavonic version, in particular, confirms DUPONT-SOMMER's hypothesis identifying the legislator with the Scrolls' Master of Righteousness. PHILONENKO concludes, in enthusiastic haste, that the antiquity of the additions of the Slavonic version is certain and their authenticity probable. If so, the version may preserve other valid traditions and must therefore be examined further.

RUBINSTEIN (257), independently examining the same passages as those cited by PHILONENKO, finds them faintly reminiscent of two passages in the Scrolls and not, as the ISTRIN-PASCAL-VAILLANT edition would have it, wholly unrelated to the nature of the Essene sect.

In a careful article based on those passages that are admitted to be genuine, RUBINSTEIN (258) concludes that there is not a single clear case of a Semiticism in the version and that omissions are due to abridgement of a longer Greek text. In a re-examination of the account of the Essenes, RUBINSTEIN reverses himself and finds no possible reference to the sectaries of the Qumran Scrolls but rather postulates that the addition is suspiciously like an embellishment inserted by a pious Russian translator or an equally pious Byzantine copyist of the Greek text. The variations are often in accord with the Latin version and may, according to RUBINSTEIN's conjecture, have been transmitted from a Greek text of a family of manuscripts no longer extant, in which case their value is enhanced.

VAILLANT (259) corrects the Slavonic text so as to eliminate a reference to the military art of the Essenes; this correction, it may be noted, is confirmed by the text of MEŠČERSKIJ.

### 6.5: Translations Dependent upon the Slavonic Version

- (260) ROBERT EISLER: IHCOYC BACIAEYC OY BACIAEYCAC. 2 vols. Heidelberg 1929–30.
- (261) RENÉ DRAGUET : Le juif Josèphe, témoin du Christ? A propos du livre de M. R. Eisler. In: *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 26, 1930, pp. 833–879.
- (262) JACQUES MOREAU: Les plus anciens témoignages profanes sur Jésus. Brussels 1944. Pp. 11–36.

EISLER (260), DRAGUET (261), pp. 839ff., and MOREAU (262), p. 36, have called our attention to a Rumanian version, known only by some fragments in a manuscript in the Gaster Collection in London and published by EISLER. This translation goes back to a Polish version and contains the additions found in the Slavonic version. A Latin translation has been published by DRAGUET (261). Though it contains no new elements, further study may well prove useful in arriving at our text of and in elucidating the Slavonic version.

## 7: Josippon

### 7.0: Josippon (Josefon, Yosephon, Josephon) (the Hebrew Version of the 'Jewish War'): General

- (263) EDWIN WOLF: *The First Book of Jewish Authorship Printed in America*. In: *American Jewish Historical Quarterly* 60, 1970–71, pp. 229–234.
- (264) LUCIEN WOLF: Josippon. In: *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 11th ed., vol. 15, Cambridge 1911, p. 521.
- (265) AUGUSTIN CALMET: *Dictionnaire historique, critique, chronologique, géographique et littéral de la Bible*. 4 vols. New ed., Paris 1730.
- (266) AUGUSTIN CALMET: *Dictionary of the Holy Bible; with the Biblical Fragments*, by CHARLES TAYLOR, 9th ed. Vol. 1. London 1847. Pp. 761–762.
- (267) DAVID FLUSSER: *Der lateinische Josephus und der hebräische Josippon*. In: OTTO BETZ, KLAUS HAACKER, MARTIN HENGEL, edd., *Josephus-Studien: Untersuchungen zu Josephus, dem antiken Judentum und dem Neuen Testament*, Otto Michel zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet. Göttingen 1974. Pp. 122–132.
- (268) UMBERTO CASSUTO: Josippon. In: *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 9, Berlin 1932, pp. 420–425.
- (269) SALO W. BARON: *Social and Religious History of the Jews*. Vol. 6. New York 1958. Pp. 189–195, 417–421.
- (270) HIRSCH J. ZIMMELS: *Aspects of Jewish Culture: Historiography*. In: CECIL ROTH, ed.: *The World History of the Jewish People, Second Series*. Vol. 2: *The Dark Ages*. New Brunswick, New Jersey 1966. Pp. 277–281.
- (271) JOHN STRUGNELL: Josippon. In: *New Catholic Encyclopedia* 7, 1967, p. 1124.
- (272) DAVID FLUSSER: *The Author of the Book of Josippon: His Personality and His Age (in Hebrew)*. In: *Zion* 18, 1953, pp. 109–126. Rpt. in his: *Josippon: The Original Version MS. Jerusalem 8° 41280 and Supplements (Texts and Studies for Students 'Kuntresim' Project)*. Jerusalem 1978. Pp. 10–27.
- (273) DAVID FLUSSER: Josippon. In: *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 10, Jerusalem 1971, pp. 296–298.
- (274) ISRAEL ZINBERG: *The History of Literature among Jews (in Yiddish)*. Vol. 2<sup>2</sup> (Vilna 1935), pp. 185–199. Trans. into Hebrew, vol. 1, Tel-Aviv 1955, pp. 334–345. Trans. into English by BERNARD MARTIN, vol. 2, Cleveland 1972, pp. 139–150.
- (275) JACOB REINER: *The Jewish War: Variations in the Historical Narratives in the Texts of Josephus and the Yosippon*. Diss., Ph.D., Dropsie College, Philadelphia 1972.
- (275a) ALEXANDER D. GOODE: *A Critical Analysis of the Book of Yosippon as Compared to Josephus and Other Sources with a Discussion of the History of the Literary Problem of Its Composition and Style*. Rabbinic thesis, Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati 1937 (typewritten).

Though E. WOLF (263), p. 231, seems correct in regarding as “somewhat naive” L. WOLF’s statement (264) that the popularity of Josippon is a link in the chain of events which culminated in the readmission of the Jews to England by Cromwell, there can be no doubt that this version has historically been of great

importance both for the Jewish and the non-Jewish world – a significance that remains to be documented in detail.

Passions run high with regard to the work, so that CALMET (265) (266), for example, exclaims, “What falsehoods and impostures are here!” Yet the work is frequently cited by CALMET himself.

FLUSSER (267) asserts that when his critical edition of Josippon appears, it will show that Josippon is not a folk-book but in truth the work of a gifted artist and a responsible historian.

Among older general surveys of the work the outstanding is by CASSUTO (268) in the (German) *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, easily the best Jewish encyclopedia ever published (unfortunately only half-completed when interrupted by the events of Hitler’s Germany).

A good survey, particularly of the outlook of Josippon on history and religion, will be found in BARON (269).

The best recent over-all treatment is by ZIMMELS (270), marked by judicious comments on the chief problems connected with the work.

STRUGNELL (271) and FLUSSER (272) (273) have fine brief treatments.

FLUSSER (267) has now written a more comprehensive survey of the three versions of Josippon, his sources, and his relationship to Josephus, the place and date of the origin of the work, and the relationship to the Latin Josephus, as well as the connection of the author with the name Joseph ben Gorion.

ZINBERG’S (274) popularly-oriented Yiddish work, with a general but cautious discussion of Josippon, has been translated with some revisions into Hebrew and into English.

I have not seen the apparently systematic comparison by REINER (275).

A good selective bibliography on the subject of Josippon will be found in BARON (269), vol. 6, pp. 417–421.

I have not seen GOODE (275a).

## 7.1: The Text of Josippon

- (276) MORITZ STEINSCHNEIDER: *Catalogus librorum hebraeorum in Bibliotheca Bodleiana*. Berlin 1852–1860; rpt. Hildesheim 1964. Cols. 1547–1552.
- (277) KONRAD TRIEBER: *Bitte*. In: *Monatsschrift für die Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums* 39, 1895, pp. 143–144.
- (278) HAYIM HOMINER, ed.: *Sefer Yosippon* (in Hebrew). Introduction by ABRAHAM J. WERTHEIMER. Jerusalem 1962.
- (279) ESTHER SORSCHER: *A Comparison of Three Texts: The Wars, the Hegesippus, and the Yosippon*. Diss., M.A., Yeshiva University, New York. January 1973.
- (280) DAVID G. FLUSSER: *A Sample Selection of the Book of Josippon in a Corrected and Revised Edition according to Various Manuscripts and the First Two Printed Editions* (in Hebrew). Edited by YITZHAK BAER. Jerusalem 1947.
- (281) DAVID FLUSSER: *Der lateinische Josephus und der hebräische Josippon*. In: OTTO BETZ, KLAUS HAACKER, MARTIN HENGEL, edd., *Josephus-Studien: Untersuchungen zu Josephus, dem antiken Judentum und dem Neuen Testament*, Otto Michel zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet. Göttingen 1974. Pp. 122–132.

- (282) HIRSCH J. ZIMMELS: Aspects of Jewish Culture: Historiography. In: CECIL ROTH, ed.: *The World History of the Jewish People, Second Series. Vol. 2: The Dark Ages*. New Brunswick, New Jersey 1966. Pp. 277–281.
- (283) DAVID FLUSSER: The Author of the Book of Josippon: His Personality and His Age (in Hebrew). In: *Zion* 18, 1953, pp. 109–126. Rpt. in his: *Josippon: The Original Version MS. Jerusalem 8° 41280 and Supplements (Texts and Studies for Students 'Kuntresim' Project)*. Jerusalem 1978. Pp. 10–27.
- (284) JACOB REINER: The Original Hebrew Yosippon in the Chronicle of Jerahmeel. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 60, 1969–70, pp. 128–146.
- (285) MEYER WAXMAN: *A History of Jewish Literature from the Close of the Bible to Our Own Days. Vol. 1*. New York 1930. Pp. 423–425; 2nd ed., New York 1938, Pp. 419–421.
- (286) MOISE SCHWAB: Les Manuscrits du Consistoire Israélite de Paris provenant de la Gueniza du Caire. In: *Revue des Études juives* 64, 1912, p. 118.
- (287) ARIEL TOAFF: Critical edition of the Alexander romance according to Yosephon. In preparation.
- (287a) JACOB REINER: The Book of the Hasmonean Kings from the Chronicles of Jerahmeel. Diss., D.H.L., Yeshiva University, New York 1966. 2 vols.
- (287b) JACOB REINER: The Jewish War: Variations in the Historical Narratives in the Texts of Josephus and the Yosippon. Diss., Dropsie Univ., Philadelphia 1972.
- (287c) DAVID FLUSSER, ed.: *The Josippon (Josephus Gorionides) (in Hebrew)*. Jerusalem 1978.
- (287d) DAVID FLUSSER, ed.: *Josippon: The Original Version MS. Jerusalem 8° 41280 and Supplements (Text and Studies for Students 'Kuntresim' Project, 49)*. Jerusalem 1978.

The Text of Josippon is extraordinarily complicated by the fact that there are three substantially different recensions, those of Mantua, Constantinople, and Venice. Though one or another of these texts has been printed numerous times (see, for example, the list of editions in STEINSCHNEIDER [276], as supplemented in my as yet unpublished supplement to SCHRECKENBERG's bibliography of Josephus), no critical edition based upon all of them has been published. TRIEBER (277) many years ago had announced that he was preparing a critical edition, but this was apparently never completed. HOMINER (278) prints the Venice edition, with supplements from the Mantua and Constantinople editions – an unfortunate choice, since the Constantinople edition, which contains the least amount of scribal interpolation, is the closest to the Ur-Josippon. As SORSCHER (279), pp. 91–92, has noted, despite the many additions in the Venice recension, there is only one instance where it contains information found in Hegesippus or Josephus but not in the other versions.

Many years have elapsed since FLUSSER (280) issued his thirteen-page sample of a new edition; but in his latest article (281) he announces that the work is now in press, and since then it has, indeed, appearch (287c). ZIMMELS (282) reports that some manuscripts still under investigation by FLUSSER are probably closest to the original. FLUSSER (283) asserts that the differences between the Mantua and Constantinople recensions are deliberate, that the former intentionally omitted references to Josephus as the author, a fact that he thought was understood, whereas the scribe of the Constantinople recension maintained the hypothesis that Josippon was the work composed in Hebrew by Josephus for

the Jews and consistently introduced him as the author. The Constantinople scribe was, moreover, familiar with the Latin Josephus, a fact, we may add, which BLATT and other editors of the Latin Josephus should find useful in arriving at that text. FLUSSER concludes that there existed an earlier, more accurate text which was not subject to the prejudice of the scribes and which he now proposed to ascertain.

REINER (284) has noted how closely the twelfth-century Hebrew Chronicle of Jerahmeel parallels the Mantua recension. WAXMAN (285) had stated that the text of Josippon in Jerahmeel had been included by the later copyist Eleazar ben Asher ha-Levi, whereas REINER establishes that it was Jerahmeel himself who included it, since when Eleazar interpolates, he uses a text closer to that of the Constantinople recension. Hence the text of Jerahmeel is of great importance for establishing the text of Josippon, inasmuch as it contains a text of Josippon three hundred years older than the *editio princeps* of Josippon in 1480. In addition, there are valuable Geniza fragments of Josippon listed by SCHWAB (286).

In addition to FLUSSER, TOAFF (287) is likewise engaged in preparing a critical edition, restricting himself, however, to Josippon's version of the Alexander romance.

REINER (287a) has an edition of the portion of the text of Jerahmeel, a twelfth-century writer, which pertains to the Hasmonean kings, and discusses its relation to Josephus and to Josippon. Inasmuch as it was written about three centuries before the earliest publication of Josippon (Mantua in 1480), it is particularly valuable. REINER concludes that it closely follows the Mantua recension, but the references to Joseph ben Gorion as the author are found in the same instances of the narrative as in the Constantinople edition, though always in the third person.

REINER (287b), pp. 2–8, discusses the differences in the various recensions of Josippon, and he concludes that the text of Josippon preserved in Jerahmeel is the closest to the text of the Ur-Josippon, though, inasmuch as Jerahmeel is abbreviating the text, his omission of a given passage is not conclusive. REINER systematically notes the omissions and additions in Josippon as compared with Josephus; a further comparison with the Slavonic Josephus would have made this even more useful (REINER, p. 2, says that Josippon was translated into old Slavonic, but this statement is erroneous).

FLUSSER (287c) has at last published his definitive edition of Josippon, on which he had been working since the end of World War II, containing the text, brief notes, and cross references to Josephus, with translations of individual words and phrases into Latin and a number of supplementary extracts, notably that on Alexander, that entered the book in the course of time.

FLUSSER (287d) contains photocopies of the Jerusalem manuscript of Josippon (pp. 55–292) and (pp. 293–308) of a portion of Jerahmeel (Oxford Bodleian Ms. Hebrew 2797), as well as (pp. 309–318) of a portion of the Constantinople version.

## 7.2: Translations of Josippon

- (288) PETER MORVVYNE (MORWYNG, MORVVYN, MORWYN): Joseph ben Gorion. A compendious (and most marueilous) history of the (latter tymes of the) Jewes commune-weale. London 1558, etc.
- (289) MOSES MARX: Joseph Ben Gorion Editions. In: *Studies in Bibliography and Booklore* 6, 1962–64, pp. 38–42.
- (290) EDWIN WOLF: The First Book of Jewish Authorship Printed in America. In: *American Jewish Historical Quarterly* 60, 1970–71, pp. 229–234.
- (290a) N. A. MEŠČERSKIJ: Excerpt from the Book of Josippon in 'History of Our Time' (in Russian), *Palestinskiĭ Sbornik* 2, 1956, pp. 58–68.
- (290b) LAURENCE H. RUBENSTEIN: The Josippon of Joseph ben Gorion: A Translation of Part I with an Introduction and Source Analysis. Rabbinic Thesis, Hebrew Union College. New York 1965. Typescript.
- (290c) NORMAN PATZ: The Yosippon of Joseph ben Gorion: A Translation of Part II with an Introduction and Source Analysis. Rabbinic Thesis, Hebrew Union College. New York 1965. Typescript.
- (290d) LEONARD S. ZOLL: A Critical Translation of Joseph ben Gorion's Josippon – part III. Rabbinic Thesis, Hebrew Union College. New York 1966. Typescript.
- (291) LEONARD S. ZOLL: The Last Days of the Second Temple in Jerusalem. . . 70 C.E.: A Translation from Joseph ben Gorion's Josippon. In: *Central Conference of American Rabbis Journal* 17. 3, June 1970, pp. 2–30.
- (292) ARIEL TOAFF, ed.: *Cronaca ebraica del Sepher Yosephon*. (Istituto superiore di studi ebraici del Collegio rabbinico italiano) Roma 1969.

The translation of Josippon by MORVVYNE (288) went through as many editions between the mid-sixteenth and mid-seventeenth centuries, twenty-one, as did WHISTON'S translation of Josephus into English in the eighteenth century. MARX (289) gives a brief description of the sixteenth-century editions. WOLF (290) notes that the translation by MORVVYNE dated 1718 in Boston is the first book of Jewish authorship printed in America, though it was not actually issued until 1722. (Thus the first work of Jewish authorship to be published in America is the abridgement of L'ESTRANGE'S translation of Josephus, originally published in London in 1717 and reissued in Boston in 1719). The explanation which WOLF gives for the delay in the publication of the translation of Josippon, namely to confound the competitors who were about to issue the edition of 1719 of Josephus, seems unsatisfactory, since from a business point of view the advantage lay with the one who would issue the translation first.

I have been unable to read MEŠČERSKIJ (290a), who has Josippon's version of the Alexander romance.

RUBENSTEIN (290b), PATZ (290c), and ZOLL (290d) have divided the translation of Josippon into English among themselves. They do not report any variants, even the many major ones, in the recensions. Their introductions summarize the scholarship pertaining to Josippon, with particular preference for ZETTLIN'S views.

ZOLL (291) has published a spirited translation, but without introduction and notes, of a portion of Josippon. Inasmuch as there has been no complete translation of the work into English since MORVVYNE'S in 1558, a new translation should be undertaken now that FLUSSER has issued his critical edition. Except

for the fragmentary translation by ZOLL, the only published translation into a modern language in recent years is that by TOAFF (292) into Italian of the very first part of Josippon, containing the story of Adam through the Book of Esther.

### 7.3: Authorship and Authenticity of Josippon

- (293) HIRSCH J. ZIMMELS: *Aspects of Jewish Culture: Historiography*. In: CECIL ROTH, ed.: *The World History of the Jewish People, Second Series. Vol. 2: The Dark Ages*. New Brunswick, New Jersey 1966. Pp. 277–281.
- (294) DAVID FLUSSER: *Der lateinische Josephus und der hebräische Josippon*. In: OTTO BETZ, KLAUS HAACKER, MARTIN HENGEL, ed., *Josephus-Studien: Untersuchungen zu Josephus, dem antiken Judentum und dem Neuen Testament, Otto Michel zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet*. Göttingen 1974. Pp. 122–132.
- (295) HAYIM HOMINER, ed.: *Sefer Yosippon (in Hebrew)*. Introduction by ABRAHAM J. WERTHEIMER. Jerusalem 1962.
- (295a) JACOB REINER: *The Jewish War: Variations in the Historical Narratives in the Texts of Josephus and the Yosippon*. Diss., Dropsie University, Philadelphia 1972.

The name of the author has usually been given as Josippon. ZIMMELS (293) prefers Josephon; but FLUSSER (294) quite properly prefers Josippon, representing the familiar etacism of the Middle Ages and the form in the accusative found in other Greek names in the Talmudic corpus.

The amazing sixteenth-century Italian Jewish scholar AZARIAH DEI ROSSI (*Me'or Einayim* 1. 224–225 [Cassel ed., 234]) was the first who noted differences between the texts of Josephus and Josippon. He discovered large interpolations in the text and concluded that the work was by an author other than Josephus.

It seems hard to believe that as recently as 1962 HOMINER (295), in his edition of Josippon, identifies the author as Josephus and states that the Greek of Josephus was translated from Josippon, even though there are many passages in the Greek which know no parallel in Josippon or in any other version. As to the identification of the author in the manuscripts as Joseph ben Gorion, whereas the name of Josephus' father was Mattathias, he adopts the point of view of the fifteenth-century ABRAHAM ZACUTO that Josephus' father was known by both names, though there is no indication in War 2. 563, where the name Gorion appears, that this was another name for Josephus' father.

REINER (295a) remarks that the author never intended to associate himself with the name of Josippon and that he is anonymous. We may, however, reply that Jerahmeel identifies the author as Joseph ben Gorion. REINER says that this refers to Josephus, but we may remark that Josephus' father was named Mattityahu, not Gorion.

### 7.4: The Date and Place of Composition of Josippon

- (296) KONRAD TRIEBER: *Zur Kritik des Gorionides*. In: *Nachrichten der Göttinger Gesellschaft der Wissenschaft, phil.-hist. Classe*, 1895, pp. 381–409.

- (297) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: The Slavonic Josephus and Its Relation to Josippon and Hege-sippus. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 20, 1929–30, pp. 1–50, 281.
- (298) SOLOMON ZEITLIN, introduction: The First Book of Maccabees. New York 1950.
- (299) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: Josippon. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 53, 1962–63, pp. 277–297.
- (300) ESTHER SORSCHER: A Comparison of Three Texts: The Wars, the Hege-sippus, and the Yosippon. Diss., M.A., Yeshiva University, New York. January 1973.
- (301) ABRAHAM A. NEUMAN: Josippon: History and Pietism. In: SAUL LIEBERMAN, ed.: Alexander Marx Jubilee Volume. New York 1950. Pp. 637–667. Rpt. in: ABRAHAM A. NEUMAN: Landmarks and Goals: Historical Studies and Addresses. Philadelphia 1953. Pp. 1–34.
- (302) UMBERTO CASSUTO: Una lettera ebraica del secolo X. In: *Giornale della Società Asiatica Italiana* 29, 1918–20, pp. 97–110.
- (303) DAVID G. FLUSSER: The Author of the Book of Josippon. His Personality and His Age (in Hebrew). In: *Zion* 18, 1953, pp. 109–126.
- (304) SALO W. BARON: Social and Religious History of the Jews. Vol. 6. New York 1958. Pp. 189–195, 417–421.
- (305) ARIEL TOAFF, ed.: Cronaca ebraica del Sepher Yosephon (Istituto superiore di studi ebraici del Collegio rabbinico italiano). Roma 1969.
- (306) GUSTAV (= DAVID) FLUSSER: The Report on the Slavs in a Hebrew Chronicle of the Tenth Century (in Czech). In: *Česky Časopis Historicky* 48–49, 1947–48, pp. 238–241.
- (307) JOHN STRUGNELL: Josippon. In: *New Catholic Encyclopedia* 7, 1967, p. 1124.
- (308) THEOPHIL E. MODELSKI: Die Berge Job und Schebtamo des Josippon. In: *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 26, 1912, pp. 132–142.
- (309) ARIEL TOAFF: Sorrento e Pozzuoli nella letteratura ebraica del Medioevo. In: *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* (Università di Roma) 40, 1965, pp. 313–317.
- (310) ADOLF NEUBAUER: The Early Settlement of the Jews in Southern Italy. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* (Old Series) 4, 1891–92, pp. 606–625.
- (311) GIORGIO R. CARDONA: I nomi dei figli di Tôgermâh secondo il Sēpher Yôsēphôn. In: *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* 41, 1966, pp. 17–28.
- (312) SARA R. DUKER: Political Ideas in the Sefer Josippon. Diss., M.A., Columbia University, New York 1969.
- (313) SALOMON MUNK: Notice sur Abou'l-Walid Merwan ibn-Djana'h et sur Quelques Autres Grammairiens Hébreux du Xe et du XIe Siècle. In: *Journal Asiatique*, 4th series, vol. 16, 1850, pp. 5–50.
- (314) HENRY MALTER: Saadia Gaon: His Life and Works. Philadelphia 1921.
- (315) JACOB MANN: Texts and Studies in Jewish History and Literature. Vol. 1. Cincinnati 1931. Pp. 15–16.
- (316) JACQUES BASNAGE: L'histoire et la religion des Juifs, depuis Jesus-Christ jusqu'à present. Pour servir de supplément et de continuation à l'histoire de Joseph. 5 vols. Rotterdam 1707.
- (317) LEOPOLD ZUNZ: In: The Itinerary of Rabbi Benjamin of Tudela. Ed. ABRAHAM ASHER. Vol. 2. Berlin 1840. Pp. 246–247.
- (318) DANIEL A. CHWOLSON: Collected Essays of the Mekize Nirdamin (in Russian). In: *Kovez al-yad* 5, 1897, p. 5.
- (319) PERCY E. SCHRAMM: Kaiser, Rom und Renovatio. Vol. 2. Berlin 1929. Pp. 112–119. See also: Kaiser, Könige und Päpste: Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Geschichte des Mittelalters. Vol. 3. Stuttgart 1969. Pp. 360–368.
- (320) YITZHAK BAER: The Book of Josippon the Jew (in Hebrew). In: *Sefer Benzion Dina-burg*. Jerusalem 1949. Pp. 178–205.
- (321) ISRAEL ZINBERG: The History of Literature among Jews (in Yiddish). Vol. 2<sup>2</sup> (Vilna 1935), pp. 185–199. Trans. into Hebrew, vol. 1, Tel Aviv 1955, pp. 334–345. Trans. into English by BERNARD MARTIN, vol. 2, Cleveland 1972, pp. 139–150.

- (322) HENRY E. DEL MEDICO: *Le couronnement d'un empereur byzantin vu par un juif de Constantinople*. In: *Byzantinoslavica* 16, 1955, pp. 43–75.

On no subject connected with Josippon has there been a more vigorous debate than on the question of the date when the version was made. One school of thought goes back to TRIEBER (296), who discerned in Josippon three layers of text, one taken from Hegesippus marked by ornate speeches, one a later interpolation of the Alexander romance, and the third the original Josippon, who, he attempted to prove, restricted himself to older patristic sources. He thus concluded that the original work was composed as early as the fourth century.

ZEITLIN (297) contends that since Josippon shows familiarity with Tannaitic materials but none with Amoraic matter it must have been composed no later than the fifth century. In a later book (298) he states categorically that the work was composed in the fourth century; and in a still later book (299) the date has been pushed to the third or early fourth century, as it indeed would have to be, since the Tannaitic period ends about the year 200. ZEITLIN argues that the work ascribed to Hegesippus, which he dates in the fourth century, made use of Josippon, though, as SORSCHER (300) has shown conclusively, the very reverse is the case. NEUMAN (301) and ZEITLIN (299) note that the author was familiar with the Apocrypha, including the second and fourth books of Maccabees, as seen by the fact that Josippon identifies the martyr mother of the seven sons as Hannah, a name found only in the Apocrypha which does not appear again in Jewish writings until Josippon. Again, the author does not record the later Talmudic version of the Hanukkah miracle but only the story as found in the Books of Maccabees. NEUMAN thus concludes that the date may be even earlier than that assigned by ZEITLIN. As to the description of the coronation of Vespasian which seems to resemble that of the emperor Otto in 962, ZEITLIN explains this as a later interpolation. He similarly explains Italian words and references to Jesus. But, we may comment, on this basis one can assign an ancient date to anything and then claim that all the exceptions are interpolations. As to references to the Apocrypha, these may be explained by the undoubted fact that the translator knew Latin and thus may well have known the Books of Maccabees in the Vulgate version. Moreover, we may add, during this period a number of 'lost' Jewish traditions were recovered, as we see, for example, in midrashic material from Pseudo-Philo's 'Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum', which appears in the ninth century in Hrabanus Maurus after being 'lost' since its composition presumably in the first century and its translation into Latin presumably in the fourth century. If, indeed, Josippon was composed as early as TRIEBER, ZEITLIN, and NEUMAN claim it is, how, moreover, can we explain that it is never quoted or referred to until the tenth century?

The evidence for a date in the middle of the tenth century seems overwhelming: (1) A fragment found in the Cairo Geniza leads CASSUTO (302) to a date definitely prior to the middle of the tenth century; (2) FLUSSER (303) notes that one of the best manuscripts indicates that it was copied 885 years after the destruction of the Temple, which thus yields a date of 953 (according to the

reckoning of the date of the destruction then in vogue); and he concludes, as does BARON (304) after him that the work was written between 900 and 965; (3) From a linguistic and literary point of view, notably in the use of many Latin and Italian words and even Latinized forms of Italian and, in particular, the transliteration of Italian names so stressed by TOAFF (305), as well as the transcription of Slavonic names, which, as FLUSSER (306) remarks, shows that the author must have heard the Slavonic bilabial 'v', this date fits best; (4) STRUGNELL (307) notes that a tenth-century Arabic version by Zakariya ibn Said was used by Moslem historians, as well as by Christians in Egypt; (5) The geographical data, as MODELSKI (308), in his comments about the mountains which he identifies as the Alps, indicates, and as TOAFF (309) points out, in his notation about the foundation of Sorrento, which Josippon confused with Pozzuoli, as we see from the twelfth-century traveler Benjamin of Tudela, similarly fit such a date; (6) The ethnographic data, as we see in such details as the mention of Jews settled in Italian cities, as noted by NEUBAUER (310); the fact that the Russians are not yet counted among the Slavs, as noted by FLUSSER (306) (who remarks that Josippon in his ethnology follows Hegesippus, yet brings the information up to date); the presence of the Patchinaks between the Don and the Danube, which is possible only after 900, and the statement that the Arabs held Tarsus, which must be before 965, as noted by FLUSSER (303); the genealogy of the sons of Togarmah, the grandson of Japheth, as noted by CARDONA (311), all make the date even more precise; (7) The idea of kingship, as DUKER (312) notes, reflects a response to the memory of the brutal outbursts against the Jews in ninth- and tenth-century Italy; and Josippon, by advocating acquiescence in the divinely sanctioned legitimate ruling power of Rome, attempts to show that the Jews do not constitute a threat to the Eastern Roman Emperor (but, we may comment, this type of contention is less conclusive, since the arguments are hardly unique); (8) MUNK (313) remarks that Eleazar Kallir, a poet who lived sometime between the seventh and tenth centuries, mentions the city of Jotapata, spelling the name as found in the text of Josippon, in his famous elegy 'Eikhah Yoshvah Havazeleth ha-Sharon'; (9) The famous Jewish philosopher Saadia Gaon, who died in 942, in his commentary on Daniel 11. 18, as noted by MALTER (314), mentions Joseph ben Gorion Ha-Cohen, the reputed author of Josippon, and this would provide a *terminus ante quem* for our work; but there is a question as to whether this commentary is really by Saadia; (10) There is an undoubted reference to Josippon in a letter to Hisdai ibn Shaprut, the famous adviser to the caliph Abd al-Rahmān III in Spain in the middle of the tenth century, as noted by MANN (315); (11) Adonim ibn Tamim, the famous North African Jewish exegete also known as Dunash, in the first half of the tenth century cites Josippon and indeed regards him as having composed his work in the time of the Second Temple, though this does not prove, as MUNK (313), who cites it, claims, that it was as old as the ninth or eighth century; (12) The great Talmudic scholar Rabbi Gershon Meor Hagolah (960–1028) of Mayence, in one of his penitential prayers, describes the death of Antiochus, the only Hebrew source for which at that time was Josippon; (13) The Spanish Jewish statesman-poet-scholar Samuel

Ha-Nagid and the Arab historian Ibn Hazam cite Josippon in the middle of the eleventh century.

Ever since BASNAGE (316) in the eighteenth century and ZUNZ (317) and CHWOLSON (318) in the nineteenth century, the work has been dated on the basis of the description of the coronation of Vespasian, which closely resembles the coronation of the Emperor Otto in 962. SCHRAMM (319), in his 1969 edition, presents an annotated translation of the relevant passage and suggests a date in the first half of the twelfth century, asserting that his dating is confirmed by FLUSSER; but FLUSSER, as we have noted, argues for a date in the first half of the tenth century; and it seems hardly likely that one who had seen a coronation in 962 would wait until the first half of the twelfth century to reflect this. Yet, we may remark, it does seem dangerous to derive data from the coronation scene, which is found only in the Constantinople recension and hence may be a late interpolation, as FLUSSER (303), BAER (320), ZINBERG (321), and BARON (304) all agree.

DEL MEDICO (322) goes so far on the basis of the description of the coronation as to state that we can obtain important data on the topography of Constantinople in the fifth century and on Byzantine practices with regard to coronations before Christianity profoundly modified them, and that the coronation actually refers to the beginning of the reign of Leo I in 475; but he does not realize that the passage appears to be interpolated.

In similar fashion, the battering-rams described by Josippon date from the tenth century; but this passage too, as noted by BAER (320), is found only in the Constantinople recension. And yet, when BAER attempts to find support for a tenth-century date by noting Josippon's glorification of martyrdom, he is less than convincing, since such values are found from the days of the Maccabees on.

Again, on the basis of linguistics, geography, and ethnographic data, it appears that the work was composed in southern Italy, as FLUSSER (303) has well argued; in particular, the use of Greek forms for place names indicates such a place of origin; and, as CARDONA (311) has pointed out, the origin of Josippon's information about the genealogy of the sons of Noah is Byzantine.

BAER (320) argues that the author's *Romanitas* proves that he lived in Western Italy, and not until Byzantine control; but, we may comment, the Byzantines regarded themselves as the true Romans, as they indeed termed themselves, and as the true successors to the Roman Empire.

### 7.5: The Sources of Josippon

- (323) ESTHER SORSCHER: A Comparison of Three Texts: The Wars, the Hegešippus, and the Yosippon. Diss., M.A., Yeshiva University, New York. January 1973.
- (324) KONRAD TRIEBER: Zur Kritik des Gorionides. In: Nachrichten der Göttinger Gesellschaft der Wissenschaft, phil.-hist. Classe, 1895, pp. 381–409.
- (325) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: Josippon. In: Jewish Quarterly Review 53, 1962–63, pp. 277–297.

- (326) DAVID G. FLUSSER: The Author of the Book of Josippon: His Personality and His Age (in Hebrew). In: *Zion* 18, 1953, pp. 109–126. Rpt. in his: *Josippon: The Original MS. Jerusalem 8° 41280 and Supplements (Texts and Studies for Students 'Kuntresim' Project)*. Jerusalem 1978. Pp. 10–27.
- (327) DAVID FLUSSER: Der lateinische Josephus und der hebräische Josippon. In: OTTO BETZ, KLAUS HAACKER, MARTIN HENGEL, edd., *Josephus-Studien: Untersuchungen zu Josephus, dem antiken Judentum und dem Neuen Testament, Otto Michel zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet*. Göttingen 1974. Pp. 122–132.
- (328) JOHANN F. BREITHAUP: Josephus Gorionides sive Josephus Hebraicus ... latine versus et cum exemplari Constantinopolitano collatus atque notis illustratus. Gotha 1707.
- (329) ARIEL TOAFF: La storia di Zephò e la guerra tra Angias e Turno nello Josephon. In: *Annuario di Studi Ebraici* 3, 1963–64, pp. 41–46.
- (330) GERSON D. COHEN: Esau as Symbol in Early Medieval Thought. In: ALEXANDER ALTMANN, ed., *Jewish Medieval and Renaissance Studies (Philip W. Lown Institute of Advanced Judaic Studies, Brandeis University: Studies and Texts, vol. 4)*. Cambridge, Mass. 1967. Pp. 19–48.
- (331) SARA R. DUKER: Political Ideas in the Sefer Josippon. Diss., M.A., Columbia University, New York 1969.
- (332) DAVID FLUSSER: Josippon. In: *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 10, Jerusalem 1971, pp. 296–298.
- (333) MORITZ STEINSCHNEIDER: Zur Alexandersage. In: *Hebräische Bibliographie* 9, 1869, pp. 16–19.
- (334) BEN ZION WACHOLDER: Nicolaus of Damascus. Berkeley 1962.
- (335) HENRY E. DEL MEDICO: Zahab parwayim. L'or fructifère dans la tradition juive. In: *Vetus Testamentum* 13, 1963, pp. 158–186.
- (336) PIERRE GRELOT: Parwaïm des Chroniques à l'Apocryphe de la Genèse. In: *Vetus Testamentum* 11, 1961, pp. 30–38.
- (337) ABRAHAM A. NEUMAN: Josippon and the Apocrypha. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 43, 1952–53, pp. 1–26. Rpt. in: ABRAHAM A. NEUMAN, *Landmarks and Goals: Historical Studies and Addresses*. Philadelphia 1953. Pp. 35–57. Trans. into Hebrew in: MOSES D. (UMBERTO) CASSUTO, JOSEPH KLAUSNER, JOSHUA GUTMANN, edd., *Sefer Asaf*. Jerusalem 1953. Pp. 391–403.
- (338) FRANK ZIMMERMANN: The Story of the Three Guardsmen. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 54, 1963–64, pp. 179–200.
- (339) JOHANNES SCHILDENBERGER, ed. and trans.: *Das Buch Esther (Die Heilige Schrift des Alten Testamentes, 4 Bd., 3 Abt.)*. Bonn 1941.
- (340) CAREY A. MOORE: On the Origins of the LXX Additions to the Book of Esther. In: *Journal of Biblical Literature* 92, 1973, pp. 382–393.
- (341) ARIEL TOAFF: La storia di Ester nella letteratura ebraica medievale. In: *Annuario di Studi Ebraici*, 1968–69. pp. 25–36; Appendix: La storia di Ester nello Josephon, pp. 37–45.
- (342) GERSON D. COHEN: The Story of Hannah and Her Seven Sons in Hebrew Literature. In: *Mordecai M. Kaplan Jubilee Volume, Hebrew Section*. New York 1953. Pp. 109–122.
- (343) ALFREDO RAVENNA: I Maccabei nella letteratura talmudica. In: *Rivista Biblica* 10, 1962, pp. 384–391.
- (344) YITZHAK BAER: The Book of Josippon the Jew (in Hebrew). In: *Sefer Benzion Dinaburg*. Jerusalem 1949. Pp. 178–205.
- (345) SIDNEY B. HOENIG: *Dorshé Halakot* in the Peshet Nahum Scrolls. In: *Journal of Biblical Literature* 83, 1964, pp. 119–138.
- (346) ABRAHAM A. NEUMAN: A Note on John the Baptist and Jesus in *Josippon*. In: *Hebrew Union College Annual* 23.2, 1950–51, pp. 137–149.
- (347) DAVID G. FLUSSER: An 'Alexander Geste' in a Parma Ms. (in Hebrew). In: *Tarbiz* 26, 1956–57, pp. 165–184.

- (348) LUITPOLD WALLACH: Quellenkritische Studien zum hebräischen Josippon: I: Josippon und Alexanderroman. In: *Monatsschrift für die Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums* 82, 1938, pp. 190–198.
- (348a) LUITPOLD WALLACH: Quellenkritische Studien zum hebräischen Josippon. In: *Monatsschrift für die Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums* 83, 1939 [1963], pp. 288–301. Trans. into English: *Yosippon and the Alexander Romance*. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 37, 1946–47, pp. 407–422.

Josippon's major source is Hegesippus. SORSCHER (323), as noted above, on the basis of a study of Book 3 of the 'War' and of the corresponding passages in Hegesippus and Josippon, concludes that Josippon omits more than Hegesippus does from the 'War' and never includes anything omitted by Hegesippus. This, we may comment, would not hold true to the same degree for the rest of Josippon, especially Book 1, but its accuracy basically remains.

It is problematic, however, despite TRIEBER (324) and ZEITLIN (325), that the author had much knowledge of patristic sources. In addition, as FLUSSER (326) (327) concludes, he had at his disposal a Latin Bible and sixteen of the twenty books of the 'Antiquities' in a Latin version.

FLUSSER (327) has located the manuscript of the Latin Josephus upon which Josippon is dependent. This manuscript bears the date 576, and FLUSSER suggests that this represents either the date when the Latin translation was made or the date when the manuscript was copied.

That the author was indeed well versed in Latin was made clear already by BREITHAUPT (328) in his references to the classical sources underlying Josippon's mythology.

TOAFF (329) notes that in some places the author betrays an attempt at translating Latin phrases into Hebrew. TOAFF also, in his commentary on the second chapter of Josippon relating the story of Zepho, the grandson of Esau, whom he, like the rabbis of the Talmud, makes one of the founders of Rome, notes parallels with Books 8, 10, and 12 of Virgil's 'Aeneid' in Josippon's account of the war between Aeneas king of Carthage (Angias in Josippon) and Turnus king of Benevento, where Josippon's Pablus = Pallas; but this would hardly prove that the author knew Virgil first-hand.

It does seem an exaggeration for COHEN (330) to assert that Josippon sets forth the essentials of Livy and Virgil from a Jewish point of view, since there is little, if anything, that can be said to go back definitely to Virgil and Livy rather than to one of the many handbooks and encyclopedias that were popular during the age and that the author may have known. The same type of source would explain the narrative of the Caesarean birth of Julius Caesar, which ZEITLIN (325) offers as proof that Josippon knew Pliny the Elder.

Josippon's genealogy of the Italian kings, as COHEN (330) rightly remarks, is uncannily accurate, and the fact that he departs from the sources known to us would indicate that he had an independent source.

DUKER's (331) thesis that Josippon was influenced by classical Christian *Romanitas* both in his theory of history and in his enumeration of the qualities of a good ruler is, we may comment, hard to prove because such ideas are too broad; and the fact that Josippon notes the common ancestry of the Romans and

Jews, mentioning a treaty between David and Romulus, may be merely in line with the historic fact, noted by Josephus (*Ant.* 12. 414–419), that the Maccabees formed an alliance with the Romans. In any case, we may add, the idea of a common ancestry of Romans and Jews is not an attack on the rabbinic idea of Rome as wicked, since the Jerusalem Talmud (*Ta'anith* 4.8, 68d) also has a tradition tracing the Romans back to Esau, the twin-brother of Jacob.

It is usually stated, for example by FLUSSER (332), that Josippon knew no Greek. The fact that, as STEINSCHNEIDER (333) remarks, Josephus is indebted to Pseudo-Callisthenes for the Alexander saga does not, of course, prove that Josippon knew Greek, since the Alexander romance was extant in Latin in many details by the tenth century.

ZEITLIN (325) argues that the author was acquainted with Josephus in Greek and that the letters in his work are taken from Josephus, with the name of the sender first (without the preposition 'from'); but, we may reply, Josippon presumably derived this format from the Latin version of Josephus.

WACHOLDER (334), pp. 11–13, argues that Josippon drew upon Nicolaus of Damascus in Greek since, like Nicolaus, he is more favorable to the Herods than Josephus himself; but, we may respond, there is no indication that Nicolaus was still extant in southern Italy in the tenth century; and, in any case, if he did know Greek he should have betrayed this in such matters as his transliteration of proper names, which he does not.

DEL MEDICO (335), disagreeing with GRELOT (336), argues that Parwayim in the Genesis Apocryphon is not a mythological region but refers to the mythical, gold-bearing tree, and that Josippon is closer to the tradition found in the Apocryphon than is his Greek original.

NEUMAN (337), comparing the accounts of Daniel and Zerubbabel in Josephus, Josippon, and the Apocrypha, concludes that Josephus, as well as the Septuagint, draw upon an earlier, more elaborate Daniel literature which is no longer extant (Josephus, *Antiquities* 10. 267, speaks of books that Daniel wrote), since there are differences between Josippon and the Apocrypha. He remarks that the omission of the Prayer of Azariah and the Song of the Three Children from Josippon is puzzling, especially in view of the latter's preference for the kind of oratorical declamations that are contained there, and suggests that these texts were not extant in the version available to Josippon, pointing to an extremely early date for the Ur-Josippon. In the *Story of the Three Pages*, Josippon says that the king is strongest, whereas his source, *I Esdras*, says that wine is strongest; and NEUMAN concludes that this is striking evidence of the early age of Josippon. But, we may reply, all that it may indicate is that the author did not want to offend the sensibilities of the Emperor.

ZIMMERMANN (338), in his comparison of this story as found in *Antiquities* 11. 32–67, Josippon, and *I Esdras*, concludes that the original source of the story was in Aramaic and non-Jewish, since it does not mention G-d or the Torah as strongest, and that it had nothing to do with Darius but that it was referred to him in order to introduce Zerubbabel. But by such a standard, we may remark, the Book of Esther, which in the Hebrew similarly does not mention G-d or the Torah, must be of non-Jewish origin! Josippon's version

here seems to be a mixture of I Esdras and Josephus, which he apparently knew in the Latin version.

SCHILDENBERGER (339), pp. 6–7, concludes that for the story of Esther, Josippon is dependent not only on Josephus but also, since Josippon has Mordecai's dream (Addition A in the Septuagint), whereas Josephus does not, on an Aramaic appendix; but a simpler explanation, we may suggest, is that Josippon knew the Latin version, since there are other indicators that he knew the Apocrypha.

MOORE (340) suggests that Josippon derived Addition A and Addition C (the prayer of Mordecai) from the Septuagint, but we may remark that it is more likely that Josippon derived them from the Vulgate.

TOAFF (341), in his attempt to refute NEUMAN (337), suggests that many apocryphal narratives might have been preserved orally; but, we may object, this seems unlikely, since they had been committed to writing many centuries earlier. More likely Josippon knew them through Latin translations.

The fact, noted by COHEN (342) and RAVENNA (343), that Josippon is the first source in Hebrew that mentions the name of Hannah (not, to be sure, in the Mantua recension) as the mother of the seven martyrs need not lead us to conclude, as does ZEITLIN (325), that the author knew the second or fourth book of Maccabees in the original, where the name similarly occurs, but rather that he knew the Latin version.

BAER (344) contends that the author was unique in that he combined an education in the Latin language and literature with an outstanding Talmudic background, but that he sought to hide his attainments. Similarly ZEITLIN (325) says that Josippon makes extensive use of Tannaitic, yet not of Amoraic, sources (he thus records the version of the Hanukkah miracle found in the Books of Maccabees but not in the Talmud), and that Josippon even served as a source for the Talmud's version of the story of Hannah and her seven sons. But the Apocrypha, in a Latin translation, as we have suggested, would more readily explain the latter; and as to the story of the founding of Rome by Esau's descendants, as discussed by COHEN (330), this hardly need show a profound knowledge of Midrash. Thus BAER's (344) attempt to make the author into a kind of medieval Azariah dei Rossi fails, since there is little real proof in the work of Talmudic (or, according to ZEITLIN, more precisely Tannaitic) knowledge.

HOENIG (345), who adopts ZEITLIN's view that Josippon was written in the early fourth century, notes that the original Greek of Josephus does not mention the Pharisees by name in the narrative of their crucifixion by Alexander Jannaeus (War 1. 92, 197; Ant. 13. 376, 379) or, for that matter, at any time during Jannaeus' reign, whereas Josippon does; and he contends that this is evidence that Josippon had additional sources for the history of the Second Temple. This source was not Peshet Nahum, he says, since Josippon follows a traditional rather than a sectarian line. We may comment, however, that in view of the power and influence of the Pharisees with the masses of Jews as stated in Antiquities 13. 401, as even Jannaeus himself acknowledged on his deathbed, one does not have to presuppose an additional source for ur-Josippon to account for his identifying the leaders of the Jewish masses who opposed Jannaeus with the

Pharisees. As a matter of fact, Jannaeus himself admits (Ant. 13. 402) that he had come into conflict with the Jews because the Pharisees had been badly treated by him; this, we may suggest, refers to the eight hundred Jewish leaders crucified by him (Ant. 13. 380).

As to the passages on Jesus and John, NEUMAN (346) argues that the references to Jesus are spurious, but that those mentioning John are genuine, a conclusion, we might add, paralleling that of many scholars with regard to the passages concerning them in the original 'Antiquities'. As a source for the John passage, NEUMAN assumes the existence of a Jewish source common to Josephus, the New Testament, and Josippon; but this seems unlikely, since there is no indication that any such source was available to the author of Josippon at the time when the work was composed. A more likely source is Hegesippus.

The source of the Alexander-romance, which, as FLUSSER (347) shows, appears in a Parma manuscript but not in the Constantinople or Mantua versions and hence appears to be a later addition, presents a special problem. In a careful study WALLACH (348) shows that the first part of Josippon's account of Alexander is a twelfth-century interpolation in an old medieval folk-book. In a critical investigation of the second part of the Alexander romance in Josippon, WALLACH (348a) constructs a stemma indicating the relationship among the Arabic, Ethiopic, and Hebrew versions of Josippon. The German original of this latter article was to have been published in 1939; but the Nazis prevented this volume of the periodical from appearing, and it was not published until 1963.

FLUSSER (347) has noted three strands in the narrative, two of which, Pseudo-Callisthenes and a Greek history of the world from Alexander to Augustus, were already known as an interpolation in several recensions of Josippon; but the interpolator, who inserted the story no later than 1060/1, changed much of the text.

## 7.6: The Content and Outlook of Josippon

- (349) ABRAHAM A. NEUMAN: Josippon: History and Pietism. In: SAUL LIEBERMAN, ed.: Alexander Marx Jubilee Volume. New York 1950. Pp. 637–667. Rpt. in: ABRAHAM A. NEUMAN, Landmarks and Goals: Historical Studies and Addresses. Philadelphia 1953. Pp. 1–34.
- (350) ESTHER SORSCHER: A Comparison of Three Texts: The Wars, the Hegesippus, and the Yosippon. Diss., M.A., Yeshiva University, New York. January 1973.
- (351) HIRSCH J. ZIMMELS: Aspects of Jewish Culture: Historiography. In: CECIL ROTH, ed., The World History of the Jewish People. Second Series. Vol. 2: The Dark Ages. New Brunswick, New Jersey 1966.
- (352) HANS LEWY: Josephus the Physician: A Medieval Legend of the Destruction of Jerusalem. In: Journal of the Warburg Institute 1, 1937–38, pp. 221–242. Trans. into Hebrew in his: Studies in Jewish Hellenism. Jerusalem 1960. Pp. 266–293.
- (353) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: The Essenes and Messianic Expectations: A Historical Study of the Sects and Ideas During the Second Jewish Commonwealth. In: Jewish Quarterly Review 45, 1954–55, pp. 83–119.

- (354) HENRY E. DEL MEDICO: *Le myth des Esséniens des origines à la fin du moyen âge*. Paris 1958.
- (354a) YITZHAK BAER: *The Book of Josippon the Jew* (in Hebrew). In: *Sefer Benzion Dinaburg*. Jerusalem 1949. Pp. 178–205.
- (354b) DAVID FLUSSER: *The Author of the Book of Josippon: His Personality and His Age* (in Hebrew). In: *Zion* 18, 1953, pp. 109–126. Rpt. in his: *Josippon: The Original Version MS*. Jerusalem 8° 41280 and Supplements (Texts and Studies for Students 'Kuntresim' Project). Jerusalem 1978. Pp. 10–27.
- (354c) JACOB REINER: *The Jewish War: Variations in the Historical Narratives in the Texts of Josephus and the Yosippon*. Diss., Dropsie University, Philadelphia 1972.
- (354d) SAMUEL SCHAFLER: *The Hasmoneans in Jewish Historiography*. Diss., D.H.L., Jewish Theological Seminary, New York 1973.
- (354e) SHLOMO SIMONSOHN: *Afterword*. In: SALO W. BARON and GEORGE S. WISE, ed., *Violence and Defense in the Jewish Experience*. Philadelphia 1977. Pp. 337–343.

Both NEUMAN (349) and SORSCHER (350), in their comparisons of Josephus' 'War' and Josippon, conclude that whereas Josephus is, from a Jewish point of view, cold, detached, defeatist, frequently revealing a pro-Roman and anti-independence bias, Josippon is intensely and proudly Jewish, noting the struggle of the Jews to keep their land and Temple from being defiled by Gentiles and, as we have noted SORSCHER indicates, countering Hegesippus' negative attitude toward the Jews. NEUMAN goes further and contends that Josippon's religious views are more characteristically Jewish than those of Josephus; but in this conclusion, we may suggest, NEUMAN has been unduly influenced by the Hebrew terminology used by Josippon.

As a contribution to historical knowledge, the value of Josippon is slight or even negative, and, in general, as ZIMMELS (351) asserts, the effrontery of some scholars in imputing historical significance to certain passages has had little success. Occasionally Josippon introduces outright errors, as when he confuses Eleazar ben Jair, the leader of the Sicarii at Masada, with his enemy Eleazar ben Anan, and Josephus with Joseph ben Gorion.

LEWY (352), p. 227, suggests that Josippon was composed as a Jewish retort to the 'Testimonium Flavianum'.

One must beware lest one impute too much significance to Josippon's choice of terminology. Thus ZEITLIN (353) notes that where Josephus has 'Essenes' Josippon uses the term Hasidim; and he then follows CHRISTIAN D. GINSBURG, ZACHARIAS FRANKEL, ABRAHAM GEIGER, and KAUFMANN KOHLER in identifying the Essenes with the Hasidim.

DEL MEDICO (354) proceeds to stress that the fact that Josippon never mentions the Essenes by name is evidence for his theory that they never existed. But a simpler explanation, in our opinion, is that the choice of the term Hasidim is an attempt by the translator to arrive at a similar-sounding term in Hebrew, perhaps being aware, through his knowledge of the Apocryphal I and II Maccabees in Latin, of the group known as Hasidim, the pietists of the Maccabean period.

BAER (354a) concludes that Josippon, though dependent upon his sources, selected his material carefully and deliberately, and that therefore the work reflects the views of the author. He recognizes two opposing trends running

through Josippon, one to submit to the Romans and the other to suffer martyrdom.

FLUSSER (354b) regards Josippon as a serious historian, looks upon the work as a mere paraphrase of the 'War', and concludes that there is no basis for viewing the book as an ideological one. We may reply, however, that in his version of the Masada episode, for example, Josippon constantly stresses that the defenders were fighting for G-d, people, Temple, and Torah. As compared with Hegesippus, upon whom he is certainly dependent, however, Josippon introduced a new element, for it is only in Josippon that we find the emphasis upon the Jews fighting for religious rights. We may comment that in view of Jesus' negative attitude toward the Temple, Hegesippus, as a Christian, could hardly glorify anyone fighting for the Temple. Again, we may suggest that if we wish to see the distinctive flavor of Josippon we would do well to compare Josippon's account of the Masada episode with that of Josephus. We shall then note in Josippon both the quietistic rejection of open Messianism and a heroic precursor of the ideology of martyrdom, with an elaboration of the motif of the binding of Isaac and the enjoining of suicide by Eleazar ben Jair because the Romans would force the Jews to violate the Torah laws pertaining to sexual acts and idol worship. The fact that in the end the Masada warriors did not commit suicide according to Josippon shows that he was apparently not convinced by Eleazar's arguments; and, indeed, a case can be made that Josippon has, in effect, transposed the Masada incident temporally to the tenth century.

REINER (354c), comparing the outlook of Josippon with that of Josephus, concludes that whereas Josephus views the confrontation between the Jews and the Romans as a war for national liberty and as an attempt to eliminate Judean servitude to Rome by the use of military force, Josippon looks upon the war as a holy struggle, wherein not liberty is at stake but rather Jerusalem, the City of G-d, and the Temple, the House of G-d, together with the Judeans, the People of G-d.

SCHAFLER (354d), pp. 19–23, notes that Josippon admires and even glorifies the piety and heroism of the Hasmonians, omitting the undertones and ambiguities that mar Josephus' account. The author was not simply a copyist but freely adapted material from Josephus and from rabbinic literature. He concludes that in his account of the subsequent history of the Hasmonian dynasty, Josippon generally follows the rabbis when they differ from Josephus.

SIMONSOHN (354e) compares the attitude toward martyrdom in Eleazar ben Jair's speech in Josephus (War 7. 323–336) and in Josippon and concludes, independently of his predecessors noted above, that whereas in the first the stress is on political independence and national pride, in the second the reference is to the true life, the world of justice, the world to come, G-d, and redemption.

### 7.7: The Arabic and Ethiopic Versions of Josippon

- (355) MEYER WAXMAN: *A History of Jewish Literature from the Close of the Bible to Our Own Days*. Vol. 1. New York 1930. Pp. 423–425. 2nd ed., New York 1938, pp. 419–421.

- (356) MORITZ STEINSCHNEIDER: *Die Arabische Literatur der Juden: Ein Beitrag zur Literaturgeschichte der Araber, grossenteils aus handschriftlichen Quellen.* Frankfurt 1902. P. 114.
- (357) MORITZ STEINSCHNEIDER: *Jewish Literature from the Eighth to the Eighteenth Century.* London 1857.
- (358) JULIUS WELLHAUSEN: *Der arabische Josippus (Abhandlungen der königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Philologisch-historische Klasse, Folge 1, Nr. 4).* Berlin 1897.
- (359) GEORG GRAF: *Geschichte der christlichen arabischen Literatur. Vol. I.* Vatican City 1944.
- (360) M. SANDERS and H. M. NAHMAD: *A Judeo-Arabic Epitome of the Yosippon.* In: *Essays in Honor of Solomon B. Freehof.* Pittsburgh, Pa. 1964. Pp. 275–299.
- (361) LAZARUS GOLDSCHMIDT: *Die abessinischen Handschriften der Stadtbibliothek zu Frankfurt am Main (Rüppell'sche Sammlung).* Berlin 1897.
- (362) MURAD KAMIL, ed.: *Des Josef Ben Gorion (Josippon) Geschichte der Juden (Zēna Aihūd) nach den Handschriften herausgegeben.* Diss., Tübingen 1937. Glückstadt–Hamburg–New York 1938.
- (363) AARON Z. AEŠCOLY, rev.: MURAD KAMIL, *Des Josef Ben Gorion (Josippon) Geschichte der Juden.* In: *Revue des Études juives* 104, 1938, pp. 133–138.
- (364) JEAN SIMON, rev.: MURAD KAMIL, *Des Josef Ben Gorion (Josippon) Geschichte der Juden.* In: *Orientalia* 9, 1940, pp. 378–387.

In view of the tremendous interest in Josippon it is surprising that the version in Arabic, which was made from the Hebrew in the tenth century (the Arabic writer Ibn Hazam, as WAXMAN [355] notes, who died in 1063, already quotes a long excerpt from it) by Zakariya ibn Sa'īd (see STEINSCHNEIDER [356] [357]), and which should, therefore, be of considerable value for reconstructing the text of the original Josippon, has still not been scientifically edited.

WELLHAUSEN's (358) version is merely an abridged translation into German of an inferior fourteenth-century manuscript. GRAF (359) lists the manuscripts and editions. SANDERS and NAHMAD (360) give the text and translation of a fragment of eight leaves of a manuscript dating from the twelfth century relating in epitome form the story of the last days of Herod to the destruction of the Temple and including the incident of John the Baptist.

Some time between the twelfth and the fourteenth centuries the Arabic version was, in turn, translated very literally into Ethiopic. One of the manuscripts was described by GOLDSCHMIDT (361), but it was not until KAMIL (362) that we were given a modern, critical edition, based upon all twelve of the known manuscripts, carefully collated, according to the reviews of AEŠCOLY (363) and SIMON (364), with the Arabic text.

## 8: Josephus' Life

### 8.0: Josephus' Life: General

- (365) ALFRED EDERSHEIM: Josephus. In: WILLIAM SMITH and HENRY WACE, ed., *A Dictionary of Christian Biography*. Vol. 3, London 1882, pp. 441–460.
- (366) JACOB HAMBURGER: Josephus Flavius. In: JACOB HAMBURGER, ed., *Real-Encyclopädie für Bibel und Talmud*. Abteilung 2. Strelitz 1883. Pp. 502–510.
- (367) JACOB ZLOTNIK: Josephus Flavius (in Hebrew). In: *Sinai* 13, 1949–50, pp. 19–35, 185–193.
- (368) FÉLIX-MARIE ABEL: *Histoire de la Palestine depuis la conquête d'Alexandre jusqu'à l'invasion arabe*. 2 vols. Paris 1952.
- (369) THOMAS W. AFRICA: *Rome of the Caesars*. New York 1965. Pp. 101–121: 'The Jew – Josephus'.
- (370) ARON ALKALAJ: Josif Flavija i pad Judeje. In: *Jevrejski Almanah* 1963–64. Beograd 1965. Pp. 35–55.
- (371) F. SEN: Una época agitada y difícil. Flavio Josefo: personaje contradictorio. In: *Cultura Biblica* 29, 1972, pp. 289–291.
- (371a) OLIVER COBURN: *Flavius Josephus: The Jew Who Rendered unto Caesar*. London 1972.
- (371b) ISAAC H. HERZOG: Something on Josephus (in Hebrew). In: *Sinai* 25, 1949, pp. 8–11.
- (371c) SAM WAAGENAAR: *The Pope's Jews* (revised trans. of *Il Ghetto sul Tevere*). LaSalle, Illinois 1974.
- (371d) DAVID DAUBE: Typologie im Werk des Flavius Josephus (Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte, Jahrgang 1977, Heft 6). München 1977. Rpt. in: *Freiburger Rundbrief* 31, 1979, pp. 59–69. Trans. into English: Typology in Josephus. In: *Journal of Jewish Studies* 31, 1980, pp. 18–36.
- (371e) URIEL RAPPAPORT: Josephus Flavius: Notes on His Personality and His Work (in Hebrew). In: *Ha-Ummah* 15, 1977, pp. 89–95.

Few scholars have been neutral in their judgment of the life of Josephus. In the nineteenth century, as EDERSHEIM (365), p. 441, has noted, there was an almost unanimous condemnation of him by Jews and Christians alike, a major exception being the Jewish scholar HAMBURGER (366), who regarded Josephus' own steadfast adherence to Judaism and his able literary defence of its tenets as providing sufficient ground for pardoning his supposed wrongs to the Jewish people.

Among more general treatments of Josephus' life ZLOTNIK (367) must surely count as one of the least satisfactory. The survey is at second hand and contains such extravagant statements as that Bannus, Josephus' teacher, was a Christian because he engaged in frequent ablutions, that Josephus himself was not a Pharisee but a Jewish Christian, and that Josephus does not say a single word about the Oral Torah (this despite Josephus' statement [Ant. 13. 297] that

the Pharisees, in contrast to the Sadducees, accept both the written and Oral Torah).

ABEL (368), vol. 1, pp. 474–500, has an extensive survey of Josephus' career, but it is largely an uncritical summary of Josephus' own words.

AFRICA (369) presents a popular biography of Josephus, defending him as a sincere Jew, though he was not a man of heroic character, and comparing him with the prophet Jeremiah, who had suffered abuse for opposing the revolt to free Jerusalem from the Babylonians; but such comparisons, we may comment, fail to note that not only did Josephus oppose the revolt but that he joined the revolutionaries' opponents and received rewards from them. Africa's study is of interest for its frequent comparisons with present-day terrorists.

I am not able to read ALKALAJ'S (370) popular survey in Serbian of Josephus' life and character. SEN (371) has a brief biography of Josephus and comments on recent literature about him. COBURN (371a) has a popular history of the Jewish war, in which he concludes that Josephus, after basely saving his life, redeemed his honor as a good Jew by writing a history which would put the Jews in the best possible light.

HERZOG (371b) concludes that Josephus' general place in Jewish history is not entirely negative, since if not for him we would not have a history of his period and since we must be grateful to him for his defense of Judaism in 'Against Apion'. Yet his faith, says HERZOG, was not pure; for a believing Jew would not have had such close contact with the philosophers of his generation. We may, however, comment that Josephus does not mention any contact with philosophers by name (he mentions Philo in connection with the latter's political activities); and no contemporary philosopher ever mentions him.

WAAGENAAR (371c), pp. 2–8, presents a brief, romanticized biography of Josephus.

DAUBE (371d) comments suggestively on Josephus' self-identification with Jeremiah (who was similarly a prophet who suffered at the hands of his fellow-Jews), Joseph (who was similarly falsely accused), Daniel, Esther, and Mordecai.

RAPPAPORT (371e) presents a psychological analysis of Josephus as a study in the contradictions between the ideal self and the real self – the courageous coward, the unrecognized wise man, the patriotic traitor, and the stumbling Thucydides.

### 8.1: Sources for Josephus' Life

- (372) JACOB ZLOTNIK: Josephus Flavius (in Hebrew). In: Sinai 13, 1949–50, pp. 19–35, 185–193.
- (373) NEHEMIAH BRÜLL: Eine talmudische Nachricht über Josephus. In: Jahrbücher für Jüdische Geschichte und Literatur 4, 1879, pp. 40–42.
- (374) HAYIM LESHEM: Flavius on the Antiquity of the Jews Compared with the Greeks (in Hebrew). In: Mahanaim, 112, 1967, pp. 92–95.
- (375) ERNEST WIESENBERG: Related Prohibitions: Swine Breeding and the Study of Greek. In: Hebrew Union College Annual 27, 1956, pp. 213–233.

- (376) ERNEST PAWEL, rev.: GEOFFREY A. WILLIAMSON, *The World of Josephus*. In: *Judaism* 14, 1965, pp. 367–373.
- (376a) HORST R. MOEHRING: Letter to the Editor. In: *Judaism* 15, 1966, pp. 226–228.
- (376b) ISAAC H. HERZOG: Something on Josephus (in Hebrew). In: *Sinai* 25, 1949, pp. 8–11.
- (376c) BEN ZION DINUR: *The Historiographical Fragments in Talmudic Literature and Their Investigation* (in Hebrew). In: *Proceedings of the Fifth World Congress of Jewish Studies* (1969), vol. 2, Jerusalem 1972, pp. 137–146.

Aside from Josephus' own autobiography and references to his career in the 'War', the only ancient references to him are in Suetonius at the beginning of the second century, who mentions him (Vespasian 5. 6) as one of the high-born Jewish captives but not as a general, who had predicted upon being put into chains that he would soon be released (a detail not in Josephus) by Vespasian, who would in the meantime become Emperor; Appian in the middle of the second century, who (fragment 17, p. 534, in PAUL VIERECK and ANTON G. ROOS, ed., *Appian, Historia Romana*, Leipzig 1962) mentions this oracle in the twenty-second book of his Roman history; Dio Cassius at the beginning of the third century, who notes (66. 1) that Josephus, when captured, had predicted that within a year (again a detail at variance with Josephus, according to whom he was released two years after his capture), Vespasian, having become emperor, would release him; and Porphyry (*De Abstinencia ab Esu Animalium* 4. 11), who remarks that the three philosophic schools – Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes – had often been described by Josephus, notably in the second book of his Jewish history (not the title of the 'War' in our manuscripts), in the eighteenth of the 'Archaeology', and the second of the 'Against the Greeks' (not the title of 'Against Apion' in our manuscripts), though the last in the extant manuscripts never refers to the Essenes.

One question that has intrigued several scholars is why Josephus is not mentioned anywhere in the huge Talmudic corpus. ZLOTNIK (372) suggests that it is because Josephus was an 'outsider'. Similar questions, we may remark, have been raised about the Talmud's silence concerning the philosopher Philo, and concerning the leaders of the Jewish revolt, Simon bar Giora, John of Gischala, and Eleazar ben Simon, as well as concerning the celebrated mass suicide at Masada. It may be here suggested that the reason for this silence – and it is mutual on the part of both Philo and Josephus, since Philo never mentions any of the Talmudic sages by name, and Josephus is silent about such major figures as Hillel (unless he be the Pollio of *Antiquities* 15. 3–4, 370) and Joḥanan ben Zakkai – is that the Talmud is not a history or philosophy book. Still, the Talmud does occasionally mention such historical figures as Herod and Titus; and if indeed Josephus was of such distinguished ancestry and achievements as he claims to be, one might expect an occasional mention by the Talmudic sages.

BRÜLL (373) and LESHEM (374) attempt to find a hidden reference to Josephus in a minor Talmudic tractate, *Derekh Erez Rabbah* 5 (*Pirke Ben Azzai* 3, ed. HIGGER, p. 183), which notes that when the four great sages, Joshua ben Ḥananiah, Akiva, Gamaliel, and Eleazar ben Azariah, went to Rome toward the end of Domitian's reign to protest Domitian's decision to kill all the Jews in the Roman Empire, they visited a nameless philosopher. In view of the fact that, so

far as we know, Josephus was the one Jew in Rome who continued to have influence with Domitian, being an adopted Flavian, it would seem reasonable for the envoys to call upon him for his aid. Psychologically, we may add, Josephus was eager, because of the many accusations against him, to prove his loyalty to the Jewish people, as he did in his last written works, notably the 'Antiquities' and, especially, 'Against Apion'. According to the Talmudic text, before visiting the philosopher, Joshua, who was known for his colloquies with such thinkers, asked Gamaliel whether they should visit him, and Gamaliel at first objected. This reply should, we may add, be understood against the background of the fact that Gamaliel's father had attempted to recall Josephus from his command in Galilee. The suggestion, then, to identify the philosopher as Josephus would seem to have some plausibility, except for the fact that Josephus is not presented in his own extant writings as a philosopher and that the philosopher in the Talmudic story is a pagan.

Less appealing is the suggestion, which WIESENBERG (375) makes with some diffidence, identifying Josephus as the old man (Babylonian Talmud: Baba Kamma 82b, Sotah 49b, Menahot 64b) who was learned in Greek wisdom and who gave the advice to send up a swine instead of cattle for the sacrifices in the Temple during the civil war between Hyrcanus and Aristobulus. The term "old man" (*zaken*), we may remark, is, as we see in the Talmud (Kiddushin 32b), a synonym for a wise man; but this incident occurred in 63 B.C.E., a full century before the birth of Josephus (unless we follow the Palestinian Talmud in placing it in the time of Titus); and there is no particular reason for identifying the old man as Josephus except for his Greek learning, which, despite Josephus' own statement (Ant. 20. 263) praising his knowledge in this field, was hardly restricted to Josephus.

Still less appealing is the hypothesis of LESHEM (314) that Josephus is the priest, Joseph the pious, mentioned in the Mishnah (Mikva'oth 10. 1) and Tosefta (Shabbath 13. 13) as a notable scribe; in the latter place, it is said that Joseph was so pious in observing the Sabbath that he did not send his letters via a Gentile even on Wednesday and Thursday lest they arrive on the Sabbath. But the name Joseph is, of course, we may remark, extremely common; and though none of his opponents apparently charged Josephus with impiety, neither does Josephus boast, as is his wont in general, of his piety.

But even if the references in the Talmud are indeed to Josephus, for practical purposes we are left only with Josephus' own remarks about his career as a source of our knowledge of his life. Josephus' 'Life' will be discussed elsewhere, but we may note the distinction made by Polybius (10. 21) between biographical encomium and historical narrative, where he notes that he had already in the biography of Philopoemen described his achievements with exaggeration as required by a panegyric, but that in a history the same matters must be treated in detail and in a different manner, since the aim of history is not to praise but to present a true account of events with particular attention to cause and effect. The same differentiation between history and a biographical monograph may be seen described in Cicero's letter to Luceius (Ad Familiares 5. 12). Autobiography was still less reliable as a source of fact, as we may infer

from Tacitus' remark (Agricola 1): "Many, too, thought that to write their own lives showed the confidence of integrity rather than presumption." The autobiography of Josephus is, after all, a spirited defense against his enemies, and thus clearly suspect. The fact that where we can compare his remarks in the 'Life' with the 'War' written almost two decades earlier there are sometimes discrepancies (though these have been exaggerated) has led to still further suspicions of the truth of the remarks in the former. There may be some psychological truth, however, in the insight provided by PAWEL (376) that Josephus' work is the first extant record of a modern Jew trying to come to terms with his fate by transmuted guilt and impotence into words, and that he is the first Jewish writer to expose himself to his public, "often unwittingly, sometimes courageously, never with grace."

MOEHRING (376a) defends Josephus against PAWEL (376). He stresses that Josephus sincerely believed that the future of Israel lay within the Roman Empire and was highly suspicious of any supernatural claims of any messiah put forth by the rebels. PAWEL replies immediately after this letter. We may suggest that there are overtones in this debate that relate to the contemporary state of Israel and to its *raison d'être*.

HERZOG (376b) concludes that Josephus is not mentioned in the Talmud because he was not great in knowledge of the Torah and because he was suspected of treachery. He disagrees with the view that Josephus is the philosopher visited by the four great sages (Derekh Erez Rabbah 5). This philosopher, HERZOG plausibly concludes, was one of the righteous gentiles.

DINUR (376c) accepts the view that the philosopher in Derekh Erez Rabbah 5 and Kallah 6 is Josephus and suggests that the Hebrew word *philosophos* is really Flavius Josephus (in Hebrew the spellings are remarkably similar).

## 8.2: Josephus' Family, Education, and Early Life

- (377) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: A Survey of Jewish Historiography: From the Biblical Books to the *Sefer Ha-Kabbalah* with Special Emphasis on Josephus. In: Jewish Quarterly Review 59, 1968-69, pp. 171-214; 60, 1969-70, pp. 37-68, 375-406.
- (378) JOACHIM JEREMIAS: Jerusalem zur Zeit Jesu. Kulturgeschichtliche Untersuchung zur neutestamentlichen Zeitgeschichte. Leipzig 1923; 3rd ed., Göttingen 1962. Trans. into French (based on 3rd ed.) by JEAN LEMOYNE: Jérusalem au temps de Jésus, recherches d'histoire économique et sociale pour la période néotestamentaire. Paris 1967. Trans. into English (based on 3rd ed.) by F. H. and C. H. CAVE: Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus; An Investigation into Economic and Social Conditions during the New Testament Period. Philadelphia 1969.
- (379) AHARON KAMINKA: Critical Writings (in Hebrew). New York 1944.
- (380) ABRAHAM WASSERSTEIN, ed.: Flavius Josephus: Selections from His Works. New York 1974.
- (381) LUDWIG RADERMACHER: Christus unter den Schriftgelehrten. In: Rheinisches Museum 73, 1920-24, pp. 232-239.
- (382) ALFRED EDERSHEIM: Josephus. In: WILLIAM SMITH and HENRY WACE, ed., A Dictionary of Christian Biography 3, London 1882, pp. 441-460.
- (383) ROBERT J. H. SHUTT: Studies in Josephus. London 1961.

- (384) ALFRED ADAM: *Antike Berichte über die Essener*. Berlin 1961. Rev. ed. by CHRISTOPH BURCHARD. Berlin 1972.
- (385) CHRISTOPH BURCHARD, rev.: ALFRED ADAM, *Antike Berichte über die Essener*. In: *Revue de Qumran* 5, 1964–66, p. 133.
- (385a) MARIE-JOSEPH LAGRANGE: *L'Évangile de Jésus-Christ. Avec la synopse évangélique traduite par le p. C. LAVERGNE*. New ed., Paris 1954. Trans. into English by LUKE WALKER and REGINALD GINNS: *The Gospel of Jesus Christ*. 2 vols. Westminster, Maryland 1938. Trans. into German: *Das Evangelium von Jesus Christus*. Heidelberg 1949.
- (385b) LÉON HERRMANN: *Chrestos: Témoignages païens et juifs sur le christianisme du premier siècle*. Brussels 1970.
- (385c) LÉON HERRMANN: *Bannoun ou Iouannoun. Felix ou Festus? (Flavius Josèphe, Vie, 11 et 13)*. In: *Revue des Études juives* 135, 1976, pp. 151–155.
- (385d) ANDRÉ-M. DUBARLE: *Paul et l'antiféminisme*. In: *Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques* 60, 1976, pp. 261–280.
- (385e) OTTO BETZ: *Paulus als Phariseer nach dem Gesetz*. Phil. 3, 5–6 als Beitrag zur Frage des frühen Pharisäismus. In: *Veröffentlichungen aus dem Institut Kirche und Judentum bei der kirchlichen Hochschule Berlin*, vol. 3 (= *Treue zur Thora: Beiträge zur Mitte des christlich-jüdischen Gesprächs: Festschrift für Günther Harder zum 75. Geburtstag*, ed. PETER VON DER OSTEN-SACKEN. Berlin 1977. Pp. 54–64.

ZEITLIN (377), noting that Josephus tells us (Life 2) that he was related on both his parents' sides to the first of the twenty-four courses of priests, and on his mother's side to the royal Hasmoneans, conjectures that Josephus cherished the hope of some day becoming not only high priest but also king of Judaea. This is, of course, possible in view of Josephus' enormous pride and ambition; but, we may comment, there is no direct evidence of such hopes in any of his works; and one would think that his opponents, seeking to discredit him, would have accused him of such excessive ambitions; but he nowhere answers such a charge. On the contrary, there had been detractors of his family (Life 6), and this is the reason given by Josephus for presenting his genealogy.

JEREMIAS (378), commenting on the account which Josephus gives of his genealogy, asserts that Josephus has several inaccuracies, which may be explained by the hypothesis that he omitted two names. According to Josephus' data, his ancestor Matthias the Hump-back became the father of a son Joseph when he was sixty-eight years old, and the latter, in turn, was seventy-three when he became the father of Matthias, the father of Josephus. SCHÜRER had suggested that there was a textual corruption; but the manuscripts are unanimous at this point, and we know that during the period of the Second Temple priests, among whom Josephus was numbered, were restricted in marriage to those families whose purity of blood was beyond cavil, and they therefore had to know both their own genealogy and that of the families into whom they were marrying (Against Apion 1. 30–31). Josephus says, moreover, that his own genealogy was to be found recorded in the public registers (Life 6).

We know nothing of Josephus' early life until the age of fourteen; but KAMINKA (379), pp. 75–79, notes that when Josephus was ten Tiberius Julius Alexander was appointed procurator of Judaea, that Josephus certainly met with him, and that the precedent of a renegade Jew must have made a lasting impression upon him. But, we may reply, there is no indication in Josephus'

works that he had met Tiberius Julius Alexander; and to judge from his strong remarks about attachment to Jewish laws (e.g., *Against Apion* 2. 278) he must have condemned such an apostasy. In any case, if indeed Josephus had found a precedent for collaboration with the Romans in Tiberius Alexander, his enemies, who were quick to pick up any possible charge against him, did not note it.

Josephus (*Life* 8) tells us that he made such great progress in his education, gaining a reputation for memory and understanding (*σύνεσις*) that at the age of fourteen the chief priests and leaders of the city of Jerusalem constantly resorted to him for information concerning the laws. WASSERSTEIN (380) follows RADEMACHER (381) in noting the parallel in *Luke* 2. 46–47 in the case of Jesus, who, at the age of twelve (the only detail about Jesus' early life between his infancy and his ministry recorded in the Gospels), was found by his parents in the Temple sitting among the teachers, listening to them and asking them questions. There, too, those who heard him were amazed at his understanding (*συνέσει*). One is tempted to regard this as a traditional motif in biographies, since we find similar precocity in Moses, Homer, Aeschines, Alexander the Great, Apollonius of Rhodes, Augustus, Ovid, Nicolaus of Damascus, and Apollonius of Tyana. Though Joshua ben Gamla (*Baba Bathra* 21a) had introduced a regulation that teachers be appointed in each town and that children begin their schooling at the age of six or seven, the study of the Talmud, at least in the middle of the second century, to judge from the saying of Judah ben Tema (*Avoth* 5. 21), was not normally begun until the age of fifteen.

In a difficult passage (*Life* 10–12) Josephus says that at about the age of sixteen he decided to gain experience (*ἐμπειρίαν*) in the three sects in order to select the best. And so, he says, submitting himself to hardy training and much toil, he went through the three. Such a procedure is a common motif in this period, as we see in the cases of Nicolaus of Damascus, Apollonius of Tyana, Justin, and Galen, and may therefore not correspond to reality. It is clear from the choice of the word *ἐμπειρία*, which indicates practical rather than theoretical experience, that Josephus would have us believe that he did not merely study the theories of the three groups. Moreover, to judge from what Josephus says elsewhere about his mental agility, at the age of fourteen mental activity was no toil for him. Despite SCHÜRER, as EDERSHEIM (382), p. 442, remarks, there were no academies of Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes for him to pass through: it was a matter of practical experience. But there is some confusion in the text, because Josephus proceeds to say that, not being content with the experience, he became a devoted disciple of a certain hermit named Bannus for three years. He was now, he says, in his nineteenth year; but since he spent three years with Bannus, this would leave no time for the three sects. One solution for this apparently impossible chronology is to state that the motif of studying in various philosophical schools is a commonplace and need not be taken literally. SHUTT (383), p. 2, n. 3, suggests reading *παρ' αὐτοῖς*, i.e., with the three sects and Bannus in *Life* 12, for *παρ' αὐτῷ* (with him, i.e. Bannus). But this emendation, we may suggest, is not really necessary if we realize that Josephus had probably already lived as either a Pharisee or Sadducee (the priests, of which he was one, were particularly prominent in the latter movement) before the age of sixteen, and

since these two groups were bitter opponents of one another he presumably knew the views of his opponents well; he would, therefore, need only a few months to practice their views systematically. He would thus have spent the greater part of these three years with the Essenes, to whom Bannus bore a close relationship, since he did not know them firsthand. We may here add that, despite the common view that Bannus was an Essene, Josephus distinguishes between him and the Essenes, since he states that he studied first with the three sects and then with Bannus.

The name Bannus, otherwise unknown, has occasioned a suggestion from ADAM (384), p. 37, that it is the Aramaic form of βαλνεύς (i.e. βαλανεύς), "bath-man," presumably alluding to his propensity (Life 11) for ablutions. BURCHARD (385) objects that if so it would be a name of derision and asks why Bannus a Jew would have a Greek nickname. But this word, we may add, is frequently found in the Talmud (e.g. Mishnah Shevi'ith 8. 5; Jerusalem Talmud Baba Bathra 4. 14c) as *balan*, i.e. "bathing-master," "bathing attendant," and is clearly no longer regarded as merely a Greek word. Moreover, the name Pharisees, if it means "Separatists," is also a name given by their opponents.

We may also ask why after trying all the schools Josephus finally chose to join the Pharisees rather than the Sadducees, with whom men of his priestly rank, glorious ancestry, and conservative bent would have seemed to have more in common. Josephus does not help us in this matter, but one may perhaps be forgiven for guessing that he calculated that a man with his ambition could get further in the Pharisaic ranks, since, as Josephus says (Antiquities 18. 15), they were more influential among the townsfolk than the Sadducees and since even the Sadducees had to submit to their formulae, inasmuch as otherwise the masses would not tolerate them at all (Antiquities 18. 17). If Josephus were to choose an American political party in 1976, he would probably similarly calculate that he had more to gain after Watergate by becoming a Democrat than by staying within his conservative family Republican tradition.

We may be intrigued by what Josephus did between the ages of nineteen and twenty-six or twenty-seven, but Josephus tells us nothing. In 64, however, he says (Life 13) that he went to Rome (there is no statement as to who sent him) to help deliver some priestly friends from bondage. EDERSHEIM (382) tries to connect the liberation of the priests with the liberation of Paul, who, like Josephus, had suffered shipwreck en route when he had been sent for trial a few years earlier by the procurator Festus; but, we may comment, there is no evidence, even in Christian legend, linking Paul and Josephus, though one might suspect that their opponents, who were numerous for both of them, might have tried to link them. Josephus was successful, thanks to the aid of a Jewish actor at court named Aliturus and of Nero's mistress Poppaea Sabina, who was a 'sympathizer' with Judaism (Antiquities 20. 195). In addition to the release of the captives Josephus also received some gifts, and one wonders whether there was not some connection between the extraordinary success of the young man and a promise, explicit or implicit, to defuse the incipient revolution once he would return to Jerusalem. Of course, the gifts may have been merely part of the hospitality shown him; but the mention of these gifts would be self-incriminat-

ing; and we may conjecture that Josephus was forced to admit that he had indeed received them. In any case, the visit must have had a considerable impact on Josephus, impressing him with the might of Rome; and the next thing that we hear about is that Josephus, while pointing out the might of Rome and the futility of revolt, was forced to take refuge in the Temple precincts.

LAGRANGE (385a), p. 52, comments briefly on the learning of the boy Josephus (Life 9).

HERRMANN (385b) explains Josephus' silence concerning the end of his relations with Bannus as due to Bannus' association with a nationalistic movement similar to others mentioned by Josephus; but, we may comment, Josephus never as much as hints at such a connection.

HERRMANN (385c) remarks on the relationship, often noted, between the precocity of Josephus (Life 9) and that of Jesus (Luke 2. 41–47). He suggests that the name Bannoun (Life 11) is an error for Iōannoun, the accusative of Iōannēs, and that the reference is to John the son of John, who is mentioned by Josephus (Ant. 20. 14) as one of the bearers of the Emperor Claudius' letter to the Jews allowing them to keep the high priests' vestments and who was the author of 'Revelation' and 'Hebrews'. He argues that the name of the Roman governor at the time when Josephus went to redeem the Jewish priestly captives was Festus, not Felix (Life 13). We may remark that HERRMANN's theories are hard to accept. In the first place, to say, because of similarity of language, that Josephus was inspired by some account of the youth of Jesus or that Luke was inspired by the account of Josephus' youth is to ignore the fact that such a motif was a commonplace and that there are only two phrases which are in common. Secondly, the accusative of Ἰωάννης is Ἰωάννην, not Ἰωάννου. Thirdly, there is nothing further known from Josephus or from any other source about John the son of John that would identify him with the author of 'Revelation' and of 'Hebrews'. There is considerable doubt whether any man named John, let alone John the son of John, composed 'Revelation', despite the universal tradition that the author was the disciple St. John. As to 'Hebrews', it is traditionally ascribed to Paul; and while his authorship is doubted, there is no evidence that the real author was John the son of John, who is mentioned only once by Josephus. In any case, the John of the New Testament was the son of Zebedee. As to the name of the procurator at the time when Josephus went on his mission to Rome, all manuscripts are unanimous in reading Felix (Φήλιξ or Φίλιξ or Φίληξ), and the transcriptional probability of an error in so many letters is small. It is likewise extravagant for HERRMANN to state that Josephus, in Antiquities 18. 81–84, is accusing Paul of having caused the expulsion of the Jews from Rome by Tiberius, since Josephus does not mention Paul by name and since the incident apparently took place during the reign of Tiberius in 19 C.E. (see Tacitus, Annals 2. 85); it thus seems hard to believe, inasmuch as he was not active until a later period (the incident of his conversion on the road to Damascus took place in 35).

DUBARLE (385d) notes that Josephus, like Paul, pays comparatively little attention to women, but that this is in line with the style of the time, as we may see in a number of other ancient authors, such as Cicero, Seneca the Younger,

and Pliny the Younger. We may add that Josephus does not give the name of even his mother. DUBARLE interestingly notes a number of resemblances between the lives of Paul and Josephus.

BETZ (385e) comments on the importance of genealogy, as seen in Josephus (Life 1ff.), in Paul, and in the Talmud.

### 8.3: Josephus' Appointment as Military General in Galilee

- (386) RICHARD LAQUEUR: *Der jüdische Historiker Flavius Josephus. Ein biographischer Versuch auf neuer quellenkritischer Grundlage.* Giessen 1920.
- (387) BACCHISTO MOTZO: *Saggi di storia e letteratura giudeo-ellenistica.* Firenze 1924.
- (388) MATTHIAS GELZER: *Die Vita des Josephos.* In: *Hermes* 80, 1952, pp. 67–90; rpt. in his: *Kleine Schriften* 3. Wiesbaden 1964. Pp. 299–325.
- (389) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: *A Survey of Jewish Historiography: From the Biblical Books to the Sefer Ha-Kabbalah with Special Emphasis on Josephus.* In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 59, 1968–69, pp. 171–214; 60, 1969–70, pp. 37–68, 375–406.
- (390) AHARON KAMINKA: *Critical Writings* (in Hebrew). New York 1944.
- (391) YITZHAK BAER: *Jerusalem in the Times of the Great Revolt. Based on the Source Criticism of Josephus and Talmudic-Midrashic Legends of the Temple's Destruction* (in Hebrew). In: *Zion* 36, 1971, pp. 127–190.
- (392) YITZHAK ISAAC HALEVY (RABINOWITZ): *Dorot Ha-rishonim (= Generations of Old)* (in Hebrew). Vol. 4, part 1, ed. MOSHE AUERBACH: *The Last Period of the Second Temple: the Period of the Roman Procurators and the War.* Benei Beraq 1964.
- (393) TESSA RAJAK: *Justus of Tiberias.* In: *Classical Quarterly* 23, 1973, pp. 345–368.
- (394) HENRY ST. JOHN THACKERAY: *Josephus the Man and the Historian.* New York 1929; rpt. 1967.
- (395) MOSES ABERBACH: *The Roman-Jewish War (66–70 A.D.): Its Origin and Consequences.* London 1966.
- (396) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: *Josephus Flavius.* In: *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 10, Jerusalem 1971, pp. 251–265.
- (397) REINHOLD MAYER and CHRISTA MÖLLER: *Josephus – Politiker und Prophet.* In: OTTO BETZ, KLAUS HAACKER, MARTIN HENGEL, edd., *Josephus-Studien: Untersuchungen zu Josephus, dem antiken Judentum und dem Neuen Testament, Otto Michel zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet.* Göttingen 1974. Pp. 271–284.
- (398) SHAYE J. D. COHEN: *Josephus in Galilee and Rome: His Vita and Development as a Historian.* Diss., Ph. D., Columbia University, New York 1975. Publ.: Leiden 1979.
- (398a) FREDERICK F. BRUCE: *New Testament History.* London 1969; New York 1971.
- (398b) FRANCIS LOFTUS: *The Anti-Roman Revolts of the Jews and the Galileans.* In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 68, 1977–78, pp. 78–98.

According to the War 2. 562–568, the revolutionaries, after their rout of the Roman governor of Syria Cestius Gallus, brought over to their side, partly by persuasion and partly by force, such pro-Romans as still remained. Thereafter they proceeded to appoint additional generals, including a number of priests, to conduct the war. Among these was Josephus, who was put in charge of Upper and Lower Galilee.

According to Josephus' autobiography (Life 17), which tells the story at greater length, when he returned from Rome, he tried without success to suppress the revolutionary movements, reminding the revolutionaries of their

inferiority to the Romans both in military skill and in good luck. To escape the extremists he sought asylum in the inner court of the Temple, emerging only after the death of the chiefs of the rebels. Josephus then, in concert with the chief priests and leading Pharisees, pretended to agree with the views of the revolutionaries, urging war only in self-defense, while actually hoping that Cestius Gallus would in the meantime quell the revolution. Inasmuch as the whole of Galilee, a hotbed of revolution since the days of Judas and his clan, had not yet revolted, the leaders in Jerusalem, who favored pacification, dispatched Josephus (Life 28), together with two other priests, to induce the terrorists to fight only in self-defense.

The comparison of these accounts has commanded the attention of a number of scholars, notably LAQUEUR (386), pp. 56–96; MOTZO (387), pp. 214–240; and GELZER (388). They see blatant contradictions between the two versions, particularly in the fact that in the 'War' Josephus is appointed to conduct war, whereas in the 'Life' he is appointed to pacify the inhabitants. The question then becomes which account to believe. GELZER (388), who has the last extended discussion of this topic, and ZEITLIN (389) place greater credence in the 'Life', arguing that in the earlier 'War' Josephus gave the official version of the government in Jerusalem, whereas in the later 'Life', when he was under no pressure, he presented the actual facts. KAMINKA (390), pp. 66–75, stresses that since the 'Life' was written at the end of his life when he was famous and honored, it is more reliable, inasmuch as Josephus could now afford to tell the truth about his younger days; but, in rebuttal, we must note that since Josephus was there defending himself against the serious charges of Justus he had to be more wary than ever. He says that since Agrippa and his army had strengthened the hand of Vespasian in Galilee, it is impossible to conceive that Josephus or anyone else for that matter could have had much of an opportunity to do anything militarily and that hence Josephus was sent as a priest rather than as a general; but a major point of Josephus' account in the 'War' is that the revolutionaries had forced the rest of the Jews, including moderates such as himself, into opposition against the Romans upon pain of death. BAER (391) asserts that in the 'Life' Josephus used his original notes, but that in the 'War' he rendered the same material in a distorted fashion. There is, however, no evidence for such an hypothesis in the works themselves.

One wonders how much one can trust an account that is so clearly apologetic as the 'Life'. HALEVY (392), pp. 93–96, says that the account of his selection as general in Galilee and of his deeds there is merely boastful to increase his worth in the eyes of Vespasian and Titus, but that when Vespasian and Titus were no longer alive, there was no longer a need to write what many people knew was incorrect.

RAJAK (393) suggests that the inconsistencies between the two accounts have been overstressed, that the 'War' is a formal account inevitably more compressed, and that the supplementary data, showing that Josephus had obeyed orders and had maintained an anti-war policy as long as possible, have been added to the 'Life' in order to rebut the arguments of Josephus' opponent Justus of Tiberias.

We may here suggest that the versions are not necessarily contradictory but rather represent two stages in Josephus' activities. It is apparent from *Life* 116ff. that when Josephus saw that pacification did not work he assumed command of Galilee and fought the Romans.

The question has often been asked as to why someone so young (Josephus was not yet thirty) and so inexperienced (there is no indication that he had had any previous military experience) should have been chosen as commander in the area where the Romans were most likely to attack first. LAQUEUR (386) thought that it was because of the success of his mission to Rome in freeing the priests; but, as THACKERAY (394), pp. 20–21, notes, there is no apparent connection between the missions, and, indeed, there was an interval of two years between them. KAMINKA (390), noting that Suetonius mentions Josephus as one of the most important captives but not as a general, suggests that Josephus was actually not a general at all. But in this respect there is no discrepancy between the 'War' and the 'Life', and it seems hardly likely that there would have been such an animus against Josephus unless he had indeed played an important, if ignominious, role in the war. Moreover, in answer to the charges of his opponents, he nowhere sees the need to refute a possible charge that he had exaggerated his role in Galilee.

There is no indication that the other 'generals' appointed by the leaders in Jerusalem had any more military experience than Josephus. It may well be, as ABERBACH (395) suggests, that the Jewish leaders' main concern was to establish their authority through the appointment of trusted administrators and that they deliberately avoided appointing able and experienced generals since their main aim was not to pursue the war but to seek a reconciliation of the various factions of the Jews with one another, with Agrippa, and with the Romans.

Finally, SCHALIT (396) correctly concludes that there is no justification for the theory that Josephus was never sent to Galilee but that he seized control there against the wishes of the Sanhedrin even before the outbreak of the revolt. If this were so, we may add, Justus and his other opponents would surely have seized upon it.

MAYER and MÖLLER (397) repeat the usual version that the war was begun by extremists and that after the defeat of Cestius the 'moderates', including Ananus and Josephus, came into control. This picture has been most recently challenged by COHEN (398), who, in general, assumes a hypercritical attitude toward Josephus' account.

BRUCE (398a), pp. 360ff., explains the discrepancy between *War* 2. 568 and *Life* 17ff., by saying that in the former the exaggeration of his insurgent zeal as general enhanced the magnanimity of Vespasian and of Titus, whereas in the latter, where he emphasizes his pro-Roman stand, it was more important to allay Domitian's anti-Jewish suspicions.

LOFTUS (398b) suggests that Josephus was chosen commander in Galilee because the Galileans, having been brought back into the Jewish state by the Hasmoneans, were pro-Hasmonean, and Josephus was of Hasmonean stock and thus, it was hoped, would be able to generate popular support. We may how-

ever, comment that Josephus was opposed to the revolt and encountered much opposition in Galilee, especially from John of Gischala.

#### 8.4: Josephus' Conduct as Military General in Galilee

- (399) AHARON KAMINKA: *Critical Writings* (in Hebrew). New York 1944.
- (400) EMIL SCHÜRER: *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*. 3 vols. 3rd and 4th ed. Leipzig 1901–1909.
- (401) ABRAHAM SCHALIT: *Josephus Flavius*. In: *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 10, Jerusalem 1971, pp. 251–265.
- (402) NORMAN BENTWICH: *Josephus*. Philadelphia 1914. Rpt. Folcroft, Pennsylvania 1976.
- (403) ARNULF BAUMANN: *Naboths Fasttag und Josephus*. In: *Theokratia* 2, 1970–1972, pp. 26–44.

KAMINKA (399), pp. 66–75, seeks to cast doubt on everything that Josephus has written about his deeds as commander in Galilee. SCHÜRER (400) argues that the 'War' is much more carefully composed than the 'Antiquities', and that Josephus there entered into even the smallest detail, thus providing an account the reliability of which there is no reason to doubt; but even he excepts from this favorable judgment Josephus' account of his activities in Galilee, notably his capture at Jotapata. In answer to the argument that, according to Josephus (Life 361), both Vespasian and Titus had borne witness to the accuracy of his account, KAMINKA asserts that this would vouch only for events which they knew first-hand. Moreover, we may add, if present-day analogies are of any value, one may be excused for wondering whether Vespasian and Titus, who were certainly quite busy, had time to read Josephus' work carefully before commending it or whether, as is so often the case today, such a commendation, in traditionally exaggerated tones, was written *pro forma* to a friend without a previous careful perusal. As to Agrippa's approval, it is clear, we may add, that this was qualified, since in a letter to Josephus he says (Life 365) that while Josephus seems to have written more accurately about the war than any other historian, he will supplement his account by orally informing him "of much that is not generally known."

As to Josephus' description in the 'Life' of his operations in Galilee, SCHALIT (401) rightly notes that the account is more than occasionally vague and gives the impression that Josephus is concealing more than he reveals.

To judge from Josephus (War 2. 577ff.), he simply copied the Roman method of organizing and training an army, as well as Roman tactics generally, since he had concluded, influenced, no doubt, by his visit to Rome, that the Romans owed their invincibility to discipline and military training.

BENTWICH (402) and KAMINKA (399) have noted that the description of Josephus' great military deeds and devices in Galilee generally, and especially at Jotapata, is very similar to what we find in standard Greek military textbooks; and it is consequently very tempting to suggest that Josephus may have written this account with such handbooks before him.

BAUMANN (403) claims that there is a close parallel between the public fast that Josephus proclaimed in Galilee on the initiative of the mischievous Ananias,

who hoped to catch Josephus in a defenseless condition at an assembly to be held on that day (Life 290–303), and the fast proclaimed by Naboth's enemy Queen Jezebel (1 Kings 21. 9) as a device to ensnare Naboth; but the motif is a commonplace, and there are no precisely identical details of note in the comparison.

### 8.5: Josephus' Surrender at Jotapata

- (404) HEINRICH GRAETZ: *Geschichte der Juden von den ältesten Zeiten bis auf die Gegenwart*. 11 vols. Leipzig 1853–75. Esp. vol. 3, 5th ed. by MARCUS BRANN, 1905–6.
- (405) NORMAN BENTWICH: *Josephus*. Philadelphia 1914. Rpt. Folcroft, Pennsylvania 1976.
- (406) RICHARD LAQUEUR: *Der jüdische Historiker Flavius Josephus. Ein biographischer Versuch auf neuer quellenkritischer Grundlage*. Giessen 1920.
- (407) ROBERT EISLER: *ΙΗΣΟΥΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣΑΣ*. 2 vols. Heidelberg 1929–30.
- (408) JACOB N. H. SIMCHONI (SIMCHOWITZ), trans. into Hebrew: *The Writings of Josephus*. Vols. 1–2 ('Jewish War'), Warsaw 1923–28; vol. 3 ('Against Apion'), Berlin 1925.
- (409) ISRAEL ABRAHAMS: *Campaigns in Palestine from Alexander the Great*. Oxford 1927.
- (410) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: *Josephus – Patriot or Traitor?* In: *Jewish Chronicle* 94, Sept. 7, 1934, pp. 26–30.
- (411) JUDAH ROSENTHAL, intro.: *MENAHEM STEIN, The Relationship between Jewish, Greek, and Roman Cultures* (in Hebrew). Tel-Aviv 1970.
- (412) AHARON KAMINKA: *The Work of Josephus in Galilee* (in Hebrew). In: *Mozenaim* 13, 1941, pp. 170–176. Rpt. in his: *Critical Writings* (in Hebrew). New York 1944. Pp. 66–75.
- (413) EPHRAIM E. URBACH: *The Personality of Flavius Josephus in the Light of His Account of the Burning of the Temple* (in Hebrew). In: *Bitzaron* 7, 1942–43, pp. 290–299.
- (414) JOSEPH KLAUSNER: *History of the Second Temple* (in Hebrew). 5 vols. Jerusalem 1949. 5th ed., 1968.
- (415) NAHUM GLATZER: *Josephus Flavius in Klausner's Historiography* (in Hebrew). In: *Bitzaron* 39, 1958–59, pp. 101–105.
- (415a) PINKHOS CHURGIN: *Studies in the Time of the Second Temple* (in Hebrew). New York 1949.
- (415b) THEODORE N. LEWIS: *My Faith and People: Convictions of a Rabbi*. New York 1961.
- (416) SAMUEL G. F. BRANDON: *The Fall of Jerusalem and the Christian Church: A Study of the Effects of the Jewish Overthrow of A.D. 70 on Christianity*. London 1951; 2nd ed., 1957.
- (416a) SAMUEL G. F. BRANDON: *Josephus: Renegade or Patriot?* In: *History Today* 8, 1958, pp. 830–836. Rpt. in his: *Religion in Ancient History: Studies in Ideas, Men, and Events*. New York 1969. Pp. 298–309.
- (417) JAMES W. PARKES: *The Foundations of Judaism and Christianity*. Chicago 1960.
- (418) MOSES ABERBACH: *Josephus – Patriot or Traitor?* In: *Jewish Heritage* 10, Fall 1967, pp. 13–19. Trans. into Spanish: *Flavio Josefo – patriota o traidor?* In: *Tribuna Israelita* (Mexico) 31, 1976, pp. 32–37.
- (419) AHARON KAMINKA: *Critical Writings* (in Hebrew). New York 1944.
- (420) SOLOMON ZEITLIN: *A Survey of Jewish Historiography: From the Biblical Books to the Sefer ha-Kabbalah with Special Emphasis on Josephus*. In: *Jewish Quarterly Review* 59, 1968–69, pp. 171–214; 60, 1969–70, pp. 37–68, 375–406.
- (421) BERYL D. COHON: *Men at the Crossroads*. South Brunswick, New Jersey 1970. Pp. 151–172 ('Josephus: Traitor? Patriot?'); pp. 240–252 ('The Works of Josephus').

- (422) ABRAHAM WASSERSTEIN, ed.: *Flavius Josephus: Selections from His Works*. New York 1974.
- (423) F. LOUIS DELTOMBE: *Flavius Josèphe, un Traître à son Pays?* In: *Bible et Terre Sainte* 118, 1970, pp. 8–9.
- (424) REINHOLD MAYER and CHRISTA MÖLLER: *Josephus – Politiker und Prophet*. In: OTTO BETZ, KLAUS HAACKER, MARTIN HENGEL, ed.: *Josephus-Studien: Untersuchungen zu Josephus, dem antiken Judentum und dem Neuen Testament*, Otto Michel zum 70. Geburtstag gewidmet. Göttingen 1974.
- (425) HORST MOEHRING: *Josephus' Attitude toward the Roman Empire*. Unpublished lecture at the University Seminar for Studies on the New Testament. New York, 25 April 1975.
- (425a) EMANUEL BIN GORION: *The Paths of Legend: An Introduction to Folktales (in Hebrew)*. Jerusalem 1949; 2nd ed., 1970.
- (425b) ISAAC H. HERZOG: *Something on Josephus (in Hebrew)*. In: *Sinai* 25, 1949, pp. 8–11.
- (425c) LEON D. HANKOFF: *Flavius Josephus: Suicide and Transition*. In: *New York State Journal of Medicine* 79, 1979, pp. 937–942.
- (425d) ROGER E. HERST: *The Treachery of Josephus Flavius*. In: *Central Conference of American Rabbis Journal* 19. 1, 1972, pp. 82–88.

Like a recent president of the United States, Josephus seems to have left us enough evidence in his own words to indict him. To be sure, Josephus' army in Galilee, even with the intensive training which he had given it, was hardly a match for the Roman army. But one wonders why Josephus did not undertake guerrilla warfare, as the Maccabees had done so successfully more than two centuries earlier, or why he did not retreat with his army to Jerusalem, which he knew was by far the best fortified of all the Jewish strongholds, rather than to shut himself up in the tactically hopeless trap of Jotapata. The suspicion is strong that Josephus was playing a double role; and indeed he says, in an extraordinarily candid passage (*Life* 72), that when John of Gischala had requested permission to obtain the imperial corn stored in Upper Galilee, so that he might use the income therefrom to build the defenses of Gischala in Galilee, Josephus declined, since "I intended to reserve the corn either for the Romans or for my own use." Again, the fact is that at Jotapata Josephus specifically promises his men (*War* 3. 381) that "I shall never pass over to the enemy's ranks, to prove a traitor to myself," only to do so shortly thereafter. Again, the fact that in the suicide pact with his men at Jotapata, Josephus somehow managed to be among the last two has led to suspicions that he arranged the lots, and indeed, where *War* 3. 391 says that Josephus survived, "should one say by fortune or by the providence of G-d," the Slavonic version, for whatever it may be worth, but which is hardly out to discredit Josephus, quite explicitly states that "he counted the numbers with cunning and thereby misled them all."

Few have been neutral in the debate as to whether Josephus was a traitor or patriot. The great majority of scholars – GRAETZ (404), BENTWICH (405), LAQUEUR (406), and EISLER (407), among others – have condemned him as an absolute traitor to the Jewish people.

SIMCHONI (408) maintains that Josephus' action, including his defection to Rome, were dictated by moral considerations, namely his concern that the Jewish people should be preserved, and that his books be written because of his passionate love for his people.

ABRAHAMS (409) eulogizes Josephus by stating categorically that in real patriotism, loyalty to his people's spirit, and pride in its institutions, no one, not even Philo, ranks higher.

ZEITLIN (410), on the other hand, suggests that if Josephus had not joined the Roman enemies of the revolutionaries, an act which aroused suspicion that the government itself was disloyal, the rulers of the commonwealth would not have been overthrown and might well have come to terms with the Romans. But this is highly conjectural, for there is no evidence in Josephus' works of a direct connection between Josephus' surrender and the overthrow of the government in Jerusalem.

In 1935, as reported by ROSENTHAL (411), p. 14, n. 14, a spectacular mock trial of Josephus was held in Warsaw, as described in the Polish-Jewish weekly 'Opinja' (no. 5, 10 February 1935), under the auspices of the Organization of Hebrew Writers, in which MENAHEM (EDMUND) STEIN was the prosecutor and Israel Ostrotzecer the defense attorney.

In justification of Josephus, KAMINKA (412) comments on the contrast between him and Polybius, who also had been taken captive by the Romans. Josephus, he notes, devoted all his efforts to defending Judaism, so that, says KAMINKA, since the days of the prophets no one has arisen to glorify the Jews as he did, whereas Polybius turned into an apologist for the Romans. But KAMINKA neglects to note that Josephus also glorifies the Romans, remarking on their G-d-directed invincibility and on the consequent futility of the revolt. Moreover, the suspicion lingers that Josephus may have glorified Judaism because of a strong sense of guilt for what he had done. URBACH (413) rightly takes KAMINKA to task for attempting to absolve Josephus of all blame in the rebellion against Rome.

One is confronted with the paradox that KLAUSNER (414), volume 5, pp. 166-192, who identified himself completely with the cause of the revolutionaries and saw a parallel in the Jewish revolutionary struggle against the British mandate after the Second World War, nevertheless sought to justify Josephus' surrender to the Romans on the ground that Josephus, guided by an inner voice, was so deeply imbued with a sense of mission to record these events for posterity that he felt that he had to survive to fulfill this task. To KLAUSNER, as GLATZER (415) has noted, Josephus was not a man of the sword but of the book. Josephus, he says, never gave up the hope of the redemption of his people. But this is, in effect, we must comment, to argue that the end justifies the means.

CHURGIN (415a) concludes that Josephus was a traitor and that the self-sacrifice of the Zealots constitutes the sharpest refutation of Josephus' account. LEWIS (415b), pp. 166-169, uncritically agrees with this view.

BRANDON (416) (416a) argues that Josephus could scarcely have given a worse impression of himself than he does in the 'Jewish War', and that we should consequently not be so quick to condemn him as an arch-Quisling. But, we may reply, Josephus could not have suppressed the account of his traitorous action, since it was so well known to his compatriots.

PARKES (417) goes to the other extreme and remarks that Josephus' defeat and surrender in Galilee were probably among the happiest experiences of his

life. The priests, he says, were particularly influential among the Sadducees, who were supporters of the Establishment and who had succeeded in producing a working compromise between Judaism and Hellenism. But, we must reply, despite the prominence of the Sadducees among the priests, Josephus the priest identified himself as a Pharisee (Life 12). Moreover, to judge from the Talmud's account of Rabban Gamaliel and others, the Pharisees also were highly knowledgeable in Greek culture; and such a Pharisaic leader as Joḥanan ben Zakkai was certainly opposed to the revolution.

ABERBACH (418) argues that the government in Jerusalem, unlike the people, did not apparently regard Josephus' defection as an act of treason, and that, in any case, the government, headed by the high priest Anan and others who had in the past been consistently pro-Roman, was stalling for time; it knew nothing of how to conduct a war, and in fact missed the opportunity to form alliances with other rebellious peoples on the borders of the Roman Empire and with the Jews of the Diaspora. This government, both Pharisees and Sadducees, was then preparing to negotiate with the Romans. Hence it is the government that should be blamed, not Josephus. Some of the people in Jerusalem, says Josephus, condemned him as a coward, others as a traitor; but nowhere does he indicate that he was censured by the government. Hence Josephus was not a traitor to his government. On the other hand, Josephus was under no legal or moral obligation to accept the writ of the provisional extremist government, which, even if it enjoyed popular support, was nevertheless illegitimate. Though Josephus was a contemptible person and a mediocre historian, he had patriotic motives in seeking to allow the Jewish people to live. Josephus, says ABERBACH, impressed with the tremendous success of Jews in winning proselytes, saw the revolt as ruining the prospect of a gradual transformation of the entire Roman Empire from a pagan to a Jewish or, at any rate, a semi-Jewish state. Much of this, we may remark, aside from its attempt to make the end justify the means, sounds like the attempt of Adolf Eichmann at his trial in Jerusalem in 1961 to shift responsibility to his superiors; but the court in that case argued that this was not a valid defense for manifest crimes.

KAMINKA (419), pp. 75–79, remarks that Josephus was not the only Jew who sought peace with the Romans, and cites the great rabbi Joḥanan ben Zakkai, compared to whom, he says, we can appreciate Josephus' greatness, for he allied himself with the revolutionaries until the last possible hour.

ZEITLIN (420) says that in the eyes of Joḥanan ben Zakkai Josephus would not have been regarded as a traitor; and he puts the blame on the leaders who appointed him and who spoke openly for war but who actually sought peace with the Romans. But, we may reply, Josephus did not ally himself with the revolutionaries until the last possible hour, surrendering in 67, three years before the fall of Jerusalem and seven years before the fall of Masada. And Joḥanan did not assist Vespasian during the siege, nor did he receive any personal reward through his contacts with Vespasian, whereas Josephus joined Titus during the siege and constantly urged the Jews to submit; and after the fall of Jerusalem he received such rewards from Titus as a tract of land outside Jerusalem, some sacred books, the liberation of some friends, Roman citizenship, lodging in the

former palace of Vespasian, and a pension. One cannot avoid conjecturing that Josephus had done something to earn such magnificent treatment.

COHON (421) attempts to excuse Josephus' action by arguing that we must allow for the standards of the age, just as we must do so in judging Josephus as an historian when he gives a slant to history. This point is developed by WASSERSTEIN (422), who contends that ancient conceptions of loyalty and honor, as seen, for example, in the cases of Themistocles and Alcibiades, both of whom went over to their country's enemies, may well have been different from ours. But in reply we may state that while no one denies that there are and have been traitors, the actions of Themistocles and Alcibiades are clearly condemned and regarded as utterly exceptional.

DELTOMBE (423) leaves the question open as to whether or not Josephus should be termed a traitor; but he suggests that Josephus, as well as Agrippa II and the latter's sister Berenice, all of whom were collaborationists, were justified by political necessity. Such an argument, we may add, may always be used by Quislings; men of honor look upon loyalty to their country as overriding 'political necessity'.

MAYER and MÖLLER (424) comment on a number of points in Josephus' life, especially his political activities in Galilee and his defection to the Romans. In an apology for Josephus, whom they take too seriously, they declare that Josephus found himself in the position of a classical prophet, perhaps of a Jeremiah.

MOEHRING (425), presenting an interpretation that is hardly new, argues that the pro-Roman attitude of Josephus was not an expression of his opportunism but rather was based on a sober examination of the situation in which the Jews found themselves in the Roman Empire. He argues that Josephus was right in stating that the *pax Romana* constituted the best safeguard for the freedom of the Jews to live according to their ancestral laws. Josephus, he notes, stresses that many of the most decisive events in the history of the Jewish people had taken place outside the borders of Palestine; and he strives to prove that historically the Jews were worse off under Jewish than under Roman rule. Finally, he notes the parallel in attitude toward Rome on the part of Josephus and of his contemporary Joḥanan ben Zakkai. To this we may reply that the attempt to separate being a Jew from being a Judaeon is a misreading of the mainstream of Jewish history; since the very days of Moses nationalism has been an integral part of Judaism. If Josephus, as is true, stresses the great events in the history of Jewry that have occurred outside Palestine, this, we may suggest, is because Josephus is justifying his own desertion of the land of Israel. To assert that Josephus was not an opportunist is to disregard the personal benefits that he derived from the Flavians. In this respect he differs from Joḥanan ben Zakkai, who, to be sure, shared his positive attitude toward the Romans.

BIN GORION (425a), p. 20, briefly discusses the question whether the story of Josephus' men in the cave at Jotapata is legend or fact.

HERZOG (425b) is undecided as to whether Josephus was a traitor. He conjectures that in recalling Josephus, Simon ben Gamaliel may simply have wanted